

8
*No Proof in the Scriptures of an Intermediate
State of Happiness or Misery between Death
and the Resurrection.*

In ANSWER to

693 d. 15.
Mr. Goddard's Sermon,

PREACHED AT

693 d. 15.
St. *Edmonds-Bury*, February 25th,
1756.

To which are added,

REMARKS on a Letter in the *Gentleman's
Magazine* for April, 1756, and on a Para-
graph in a Sermon of Archbishop Tillotson,

WITH

A POSTSCRIPT.

In Answer to some *Remarks upon a late Treatise
relating to the Intermediate State, &c.*

LONDON:

Printed for S. BLADON in *Pater-noster-Row*.

M DCC LVI.

[Price One Shilling.]



R E M A R K S

O N

Mr. *GODDARD*'s Sermon, &c.

IN the Sermon before us Mr. *GODDARD* undertakes to prove an intermediate State of Happiness or Misery between Death and the Resurrection, from Scripture. Let us suppose this Gentleman to have succeeded in his Enterprize, and to have made out this Point beyond Contradiction; and then let us attend to the Consequences.

The Scripture is represented on another hand, as affirming, “ That the Dead shall not awake or
“ be made alive *till* the Resurrection.—That the
“ Wicked shall not be severed from the Righteous *till* the Resurrection.—That all Mankind
“ are upon a state of Trial *till* the Resurrection,
“ —That our Christian Course and Improvements in Piety in this World, *terminate* in the
“ Resurrection. — That the Elect shall not
“ be gathered together *till* the Resurrection —
“ That the World shall not be judged *before* the Resurrection. — That sincere Christians shall not have Boldness or Confidence
“ before Christ *till* the Resurrection. — That
“ the virtuous shall not be rewarded *till* the
“ Resurrection.—That they shall not have eternal Life or Salvation,—shall not put on Immortality,—be received unto Christ,—enter
“ into his Joy, — behold his Glory, — or be like
“ him, *till* the Resurrection. — That the Faith,
“ Labours and Sufferings of Christians are lost,
B “ perished

“ perished and unprofitable, if there be *no* Resurrection.—That the Resurrection is the grand Object of the Faith, Hope and Comfort of Christians.—And, lastly, that the Wicked will not be punished *till* the Resurrection.”

These Propositions are advanced in a late Tract published by a learned and eminent Divine, as plain and undeniable Scripture-Truths, supported by particular Texts subjoyned, in no small number, to each of them (a).

This small Tract, the Author of this Sermon had in his eye. It was the last that appeared on the Subject before he preached the Sermon; and he hath cited it in two or three places.

Has Mr. G. then disproved these Propositions, or given a different Sense to the several Scriptures which are appealed to in support of them? No, he hath meddled with very few of them: and the Doctrine they are said to contain stands good for any thing Mr. G. hath proved or attempted to prove to the contrary.

And if Mr. G's Doctrine stands good too, the Consequence will be, that we have here two contradictory Doctrines proved from the same Scriptures. A Circumstance which cannot be very agreeable to the Friends of Revelation, particularly as it tends to bring in question the Truth of the capital Doctrine of the Christian Religion, *The Reality of a future State of Rewards and Punishments*. For if both these Doctrines, the Doctrine of the *Sermon*, and the Doctrine of the *Appendix*, may be proved from Scripture, I do not see how we can certainly depend upon Scripture in any

(a) *Vid.* Appendix to *Considerations on the Theory of Religion*, &c. By EDMUND LAW, D. D. Master of St. Peter's College, Cambridge. The third Edition, 1755. pag. 373—386.

thing it teaches concerning a future State at all.

It is true the Texts alleged in the *Appendix* do not contain an absolute Negation of an intermediate State *in Terms*. But they contain what is equivalent to it. They assign the *Resurrection*, the *last Day*, the *second Coming of Christ*, &c. as the Period which is to verify and accomplish *all* the Gospel-Promises and Threatnings relating to a future State; and by not assigning or refering to any other Period, they plainly exclude any other; as is particularly evident from that single Text *1 Cor. xv. 13, 14. If there be no Resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen; and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your Faith also is vain.* Here the Apostle Paul makes the future Happiness of all Christian Believers to depend upon a single matter of Fact, the Resurrection of *Jesus Christ*. Whereas the intermediate state of Happiness contended for depends upon no such thing as a Resurrection, nor, according to Mr. G. hath any thing to do with this particular Fact; for he puts the penitent Thief into actual Possession of his intermediate Happiness two days *before* the Resurrection of *Jesus Christ*.

Again. An intermediate state of Happiness and Misery, having respect to the Deeds and Dispositions of Mankind in this Life, is an intermediate state of Rewards and Punishments in a strict and proper Sense. This Idea indeed the Patrons of an intermediate State chuse to keep out of sight as much as they can, because of an unlucky Question which it naturally suggests, namely, What occasion in such a Case for a general Resurrection, and a formal Judgment afterwards?

Of two successive States of Reward and Punishment without any state of Probation intervening, it will not be easy to give any satisfactory Account upon any received Principles of Reason, or any philosophical Notions of the moral Government of God. And therefore if two such States may be proved from Revelation, we might hope to find in Revelation some clear and consistent Reasons for *both*. Revelation, indeed, hath sufficiently accounted for *one* such State, namely, that which will succeed the general Resurrection. But concerning the *Reasons* and *Uses* for *another*, the Scriptures, whatever may be proved from them besides, have left us quite in the Dark. That is to say, if we agree with Mr. G. the Scriptures, have revealed to Mankind a great Gospel-Truth which it highly concerns us to believe and remark, without vouchsafing to acquaint us with the Importance of it.

Mr. G. indeed hath provided for *his* intermediate state of Happiness certain extraordinary Portions of divine Grace (*b*), which looks as if he intended it for a state of *Probation*, rather than of *Reward*: For what demand is there for *Grace* in a State where there are no Trials? And, on the other hand, why a *second* state of *Probation* before we have given any account of what has passed in the *first*?

In a Word, the Doctrine maintained in the *Appendix* is so clear and accountable in itself, and so consistent with the general Tenor of the Scriptures, and that of Mr. G. so incumbered with Difficulties of various kinds, that we may well presume there must be some mistakes in the Scripture Proofs of the latter; which we shall now without farther Preface proceed to consider.

(*b*) Sermon: p. 23.

The

The Passage of Scripture which Mr. G. pitches upon for his Text, as *of all others the fullest to his purpose (c)*, is *Luke xxiii. 43.* where our Saviour says to the penitent Thief who was crucified with him, *To day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.*

“ The Use which has been generally made of these Words, says Mr. G. has been to shew that this gracious Promise—can afford no Encouragement to a Death-bed Repentance, *because* there is such a wide and manifest difference betwixt the Case of this Man, and that of other Sinners (d).”

A most unlucky Observation to set out with! For will not the same *wide and manifest difference* between this and other Cases, equally prove that it is a *peculiar Case throughout*, and no more applicable to the *future State* of other penitent Sinners in general, than it is to the *pardon* of other Sinners repenting on a Death-bed? Take this Author's Interpretation of our Saviour's Promise to this dying Malefactor, with all it's Circumstances, and you will find no such Promise ever made to any other Person, much less to the whole number of penitent Believers: And, if the Fact was not so indisputably against you, you might as well argue from the Cases of *Enoch* and *Elijah*, that all Men who walk uprightly before God upon Earth will be translated to another State without passing through a state of Death, as from *this Case* that the Souls of all good Men do, upon their Separation from the Body, immediately enter upon a state of Happiness (e).

We might then safely allow Mr. G. to abound in his own Sense of the word *Paradise*; we might allow the Promise to have been fulfilled to the Thief on the very Day it was made; we might

(c) Serm. p. 7.

(d) p. 5.

(e) p. 12.

even allow his Soul to have entered *Paradise* while his Body hung on the Cross ; and still insist that the Case is singular ; an Act of Grace to this particular Man, on that signal Occasion, from which no Argument can be drawn for a common Receptacle of the Souls of *all* good Men between Death and the Resurrection.

But we are told, that “ the *Jews* in our Saviour’s Time universally understood the word “ *Paradise* in that Sense ; that consequently the “ Thief must have understood it so ; and that “ for *Jesus* to have used the Word in any other, “ would have been to deceive and trifle with the “ Thief,” with some other indiscrete Expressions hardly fit to be repeated (*i*).

That our Lord adapted his Language to this Man’s Notions as far as was necessary, there can be no doubt. But the first Question before us is, what *were* this Man’s Notions (not of *Paradise* but) of *the Kingdom of Christ* ? Now by the *Kingdom of Christ*, the *Jews* of our Saviour’s Time, generally understood a *temporal* Kingdom of earthly Happiness ; to this they likewise gave the Name of *the future World* ; and many of those among them who believed a Resurrection, considered it as introductory to the Felicities of such a Kingdom only. And that the penitent Thief himself still retained that Notion of it, appears pretty plainly from his Words *ἔταν ἐλθης ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου*, *when thou comest* (not *into*, as our Translation gives it, but) *in thy kingdom* ; i. e. when thou comest on Earth in Power and great Glory as we expect, — *then, remember me*.

Now had our Saviour told this Man that he should be with him in *this* Kingdom on *that* Day or *any* Day, he would indeed have deceived him

(*i*) Serm. p. 9.

and trifled with him ; because such a Kingdom was never to be. And therefore to prevent all Misunderstanding of that sort, our Lord promises that he should be with him in a state of Being, which indeed was commonly understood to have nothing to do with *this* World. And as the dying Penitent would sufficiently apprehend, by this Term, what was *not* promised, and that some great thing was promised in lieu of it, there was no occasion for our Lord to keep precisely to the Jewish Notions of *Paradise*, even supposing those Notions to be *universally* fixed to one certain Sense. For I suppose no body will imagine that our Lord intended to give this Man an accurate and complete Idea of a State, which, whatever the *Jews* might think of it, the Sacred Writers speak of as out of the reach of all human Comprehension.

But upon what Authority does Mr. G. conclude that the *Jews*, in our Saviour's Time, universally understood the word *Paradise* in the Sense that he puts upon it ? I am afraid he has here depended upon *Grotius* farther than he had good reason. For though *Grotius* in that long Note which Mr. G. refers to, is serving the same Hypothesis ; yet he knew better than to affirm, that the *Jews* had one uniform System of Notions concerning *Paradise*. However, what *Grotius* has omitted the late learned Professor *Westein*, in his Commentary on this Place of *Luke*, has amply supplied from *Josephus* and the Rabbins. And here Mr. G. may see strange Things in the Jewish Notions of *Paradise*. He may see among the same Prayers he hath referred us to, *Paradise* expressly called *eternal Life*. He may see translated *Bodies* as well as *Souls* in *Paradise* ; and a variety of Entertainment provided for the Inhabitants

bitants of that happy Region, little suited to the Nature and Occasions of Souls in a state of Separation from their Bodies.

And that he may likewise see, if he pleases, that his Inferences are not quite so obvious to every one who has considered the Subject as he would have it believed, I have put down in the Margin Mr. *Westein's* very sensible Reflection upon the Collection of Authorities he has exhibited (*k*).

Well, but “ *St. Paul* makes the same Distinction (between *Paradise* and *the World to come*) when giving an account of the extraordinary Revelations he was favoured with, he declares some of them to have been made to him in *Paradise*, and others in the *third Heaven* (*l*), or Region of supreme Happiness (*m*). ”

Here we have an arbitrary Paraphrase of *the third Heaven*, which our Author (misled by *Grotius*) will have to signify *the Region of supreme Happiness*. Whereas, if we take the Apostles account as it lies in a natural Gradation of Ascent from a lower to a higher sphere of Felicity, *Paradise* must be situated in the superior Region of the two. This is likewise suggested to us by the other Circumstances of the Narrative. What the Apostle heard or saw in the third Heaven, or whether any thing surpassing his Conception he

(*k*) Quæritur jam quid Christus latronem intelligere voluerit per *Paradisum* promissum? Certe hac voce, nec Judæorum fabulas, nec sententiam Essenorum de solius animæ æterna felicitate nec Phariseorum aut Mohammedanorum de deliciis, approbavit, sed illud unum voluit, ut latro optima quævis et majora quidem quam a Doctoribus audierat, vel ipse prius animo conceperat speraret, Locum tutum et securum tempore inter mortem et resurrectionem medio, et æternum in cælis gaudium post resurrectionem. *Westein* in *Luc.* xxiii. 43.

(*l*) 2 Cor. xii. 1—4.

(*m*) *Serm.* p. 10.

mentions

mentions not. But in *Paradise* he heard *unspeakable Words which it is not lawful* (or possible) *for a Man to utter*. So that if a plain Man must needs determine which of these two is the Region of supreme Happiness, he will make little difficulty in giving the Preference to *Paradise*.

But what does this Author talk of supreme Happiness in the *third* Heaven? It is well known that the *Jews* reckoned in all (not *three*, but) *seven* Heavens, to each of which they gave a distinct Name (*n*): That is to say, they reckoned *four* Regions above our Author's Region of supreme Happiness. And to these Notions we must (upon Mr. G's own Principles) suppose *St. Paul* to conform his Language: It is therefore full as probable, considering the order in which the Apostle relates these two Raptures, that he placed *Paradise* in one of these upper Regions; which he might very well do (even in the very highest of them) without offering any violence to the received notions of the *Jews* concerning the separate state of Existence for the Souls of good Men (*o*).

The Author of the *Appendix* has drop'd a friendly Hint, that *St. Paul* had these Scenes of Felicity communicated to him in a *Vision* (*p*).—

(*n*) Vid. *Weistein* in loc.

(*o*) *Josephus*, who, as well as *St. Paul*, was a Pharisee, at least in his Opinions concerning a future State, places the departed Souls of good Men *ἐν τῷ ἀγνίστῳ οὐρανῷ χωρῶν*, in the *holiest Region of Heaven*. Bell. iii. 7. 5. *Huds.* But after all it would be in vain to attempt to fix the Meaning of Christ and his Apostles, when they speak of a future State by the vague and infinitely varying Notions of the *Jews* on this Subject. The Sacred Writings, in this Point at least, are the best explainers of themselves. *Basnage* has made it very probable that the *Pharisees*, even of our Saviour's Time, held the *Transmigration of Souls*. *Hist. of the Jews*. B. ii. c. xi.

(*p*) Pag. 395.

Mr. G. upon occasion can retreat nimbly enough under *Figure* and *Scenery* to shelter himself from the Evidence of his own Authorities; and what has he got by adopting the literal Sense here? Even the satisfaction of having discovered that *Paradise*, for all that St. *Paul* knew, might be a Mansion for the *Bodies* as well as the *Souls* of Men — that the Idea of it is inexpressible and incommunicable to Man, consequently — that our Saviour did not intend to convey by this Term the precise Notion of any particular state of Felicity so and so circumstanced; and lastly — that both our Saviour and St. *Paul* most probably meant, by *Paradise*, the Region or State of supreme Happiness (*q*). From which particulars we take leave to conclude, either that this promise made to the penitent Malefactor was peculiar to *his*, and perhaps a few more Cases; or, that the Performance of it might be deferred till the general Resurrection, very consistently with the true meaning of the Expression, *To day*.

For what has this Author brought to shew that this Expression may not be understood with the same Latitude here, in which he owns it to be taken elsewhere? Nothing at all but the uniformity of the *Jewish* Opinion concerning Paradise. And how little reason he had to depend upon this Inference, *Grotius* himself might have informed him, who a very few lines below those Mr. G. has quoted from him, observes that, “ It was
 “ not without a weighty reason that our Saviour
 “ used the Expression *To day*. For the *Jews* be-
 “ lieved, not that the Souls of *all* Men were
 “ immediately admitted into the happy State of
 “ Paradise, but those only which departed out

(*q*) Compare 1 Cor. ii. 9.

“ of this World well purged.” *Grotius* indeed has worded this so that an inattentive Reader may, if he pleases, understand by it, that all the rest were utterly excluded. But this, as we learn from other hands, was by no means the Case. This preparatory Purgation was not always accomplished while the Soul remained in the Body. For the Souls even of the better Sort wandered about accomplishing this Purgation for the Space of a Year (*r*). After which they were permitted to settle in the happy Region allotted for them.

For my own part, as I see no sufficient Importance in this *Weighty Reason* of *Grotius* (even supposing these Fancies to have prevailed so early among the *Jews*) to demand our Saviour’s Regard, nor indeed the least reason to imagine that by *Paradise*, any other State was intended, but that of final Rest and Happiness; so do I see no Inconvenience in understanding the Words *To day*, of the sure Confirmation and *present Sealing* of that Happiness, without any farther intervening Trials.

In *St. Luke* xix. 9. our Lord says to *Zaccheus*, σημερον σωτηρια τω οικω τουτω εγενετο, *To day bath Salvation happened to this house.* The word σημερον is the same by which the Promise is limited in the Case of the penitent Thief. And there is not a stronger Word in the whole New Testament to denote the actual Accomplishment of any thing than εγενετο. But the actual Accomplishment of *Salvation* is nothing less than the actual Possession and present Enjoyment of eternal Life.

Suppose now the late *Mr. Asgill*, who very much wanted an Instance of a translated Christian

(*r*) Vid. *Burnet’s Exp. Art.* Folio, p. 222. and *Basnage*, *Hist. Jews*, B. iv. c. 30. p. 384.

Believer, had laid his Hands on this Text, and had insisted upon it as good Evidence that *Zaccheus* was actually translated that very Day; arguing as Mr. G. has done, that if any *future* Immortality beyond the Limits of that same Day was meant, our Lord must have deceived and trifled with *Zaccheus*, &c. how would you have disproved him? Direct Evidence of the Fact there is none on the one side or the other. And you could only have said, that as Salvation is represented according to the general tenor of the New Testament, as a thing to which Christian Believers have but a presumptive Heirship in *this* World (τους μελλούσας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν, *Heb.* i. 14.) it would be absurd to interpret this Declaration otherwise than as a present Confirmation or Assurance of eternal Life in the World to come. And if this ought to have satisfied Mr. *Asgill*, why should not the same Answer satisfy Mr. G. in a similar Case?

But it must not be forgot that there is one Construction of the *Greek* Words containing our Saviour's Promise to the penitent Thief, which limits no Time for his being in Paradise with Christ. Remove the Comma from σοι, where the common Editions place it, and put it after σημερον, thus, Ἀμην λέγω σοι σημερον, μετ' ἐμῃ ἐσθι — *I say unto thee to-day, thou shalt be*, &c. and the Time of fulfilling the Promise will be left indefinite.

Mr. G. holds this Construction in the utmost contempt: "It is low and absurd — looks like a Burlesque on Scripture, — is unworthy of a Scholar, and even of a Man of the plainest Understanding (*f*)."

A sort of answer that gives one no trouble but that of writing down so many Words.

But did Mr. G. understand the Tenor of the Argument grounded on this Construction? I am afraid not, if we judge from the childish Paraphrase he has given us; “I did not tell thee so *yesterday*, nor will I tell thee so *to-morrow*, but I say unto thee *to-day*, &c.” As if there was nothing going before to induce our Lord to *make* the Promise *one* day more than *another*.

Whereas the Propriety of this Construction (and, whatever Mr. G. may think, a Propriety there is in it) arises from hence; that the penitent thief having desired to be remembered *when* our Saviour should come in his Kingdom; that is, to be remembered at a *future Period*, the answer of *Jesus* gives him to understand that he *was* remembered *at that Instant*, and so effectually remembered, that whenever *Jesus* himself should be in *Paradise*, the Thief might be sure of being there with him.

And what is there in this either low or absurd, or void of Scholarship and common Sense (*t*)? How many Instances might be brought, where to avoid the malign Aspect of a plain Text upon an orthodox Point, very learned and able Divines have taken Refuge in Constructions much more unaccountable than this? And after all, who or what is there to put it out of doubt that this was not St. *Luke*’s own Pointing?

“Why, says *Grotius*, the *Syriac Version*,” which it seems gives this Passage as if the *Greek*

(*t*) *Est autem illud HODIE* (says *Grotius*) *εμφατικον, et solet beneficiorum mentioni adjici, ut Jerem. i. 10.*—An Observation which is neither true nor pertinent, but upon the Supposition that the Construction under Consideration is the true one; or else that the Benefits mentioned are *future*, and that the emphatical *Hodie* is employed rather to *ascertain* the *Reality*, than to *mark* the *Time* of conferring such Benefits. In Mr. G’s Interpretation, the Word *Hodie* has no especial *Emphasis*.

Words had been Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι σήμερον—e. q. f. *Verily I say unto thee THAT to-day, &c.* which indeed leaves no Room for any Construction but that in our common Books.

I am not Critic enough to know how far the *Syriac* Version is to be depended upon in general with respect to its Deviations from the received *Greek* Text ; (which by the way are neither few nor inconsiderable) but in the present Case its Authority cannot be very decisive ; since according to *Tremellius*, the Word ὅτι which we read immediately before σήμερον, *Luke* xix. 9, is wholly omitted in the *Syriac*, though the corresponding Word καθὼς in the latter Clause of the Verse, plainly requires that it should be expressed. Mr. G. perhaps may now see that the Espousers of the Construction he ridicules so wantonly, are not so much *gravel'd* as he may imagine, and that the *Absurdity* and want of Scholarship he mentions may belong to some Body else.

Having now paid our due Respects to Mr. G's Text and his several Comments upon it, we proceed to consider his other Testimonies.

“ In the Old Testament indeed, says Mr. G.
 “ there are but few Passages to be met with for
 “ our Purpose, and those not so full and direct
 “ to the Point in Hand, as that much greater
 “ Number which the New abounds with. And
 “ no Wonder, since the Law of *Moses* was
 “ founded wholly on temporal Sanctions ; where-
 “ as the Gospel was established upon better Pro-
 “ mises, and Life and Immortality could not
 “ have been said to be brought to Light by the
 “ Gospel, if they had been clearly and fully re-
 “ vealed by the former Dispensation (u).”

(u) Serm. p. 13.

But here we must take the Freedom to remind Mr. G. that the Life and Immortality brought to Light by the Gospel, was *that* Life and Immortality *only* which will succeed a general Resurrection; and which was evidenced and insured to Mankind by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. And therefore whatever was true concerning any intermediate Life of the Soul in a State of Separation from the Body, might safely be revealed *before* the Gospel without any Diminution of, or Derogation from the Light peculiar to it.

If Mr. G. by saying that *the Law of Moses was founded on temporal Sanctions only*, means to insinuate that the Revelation of an intermediate State of Happiness and Misery for departed Souls would have clashed with the Sanctions of the *Mosaic Dispensation*; I answer that the very same Inconvenience would arise from the Revelation of such a State under the Gospel. The Sanctions of the Gospel are Rewards and Punishments in a future State (not where the Soul exists separately from the Body, but) where the body will be raised to a new Life, and the compound Man so reanimated brought to a Judgment which will have respect alone to the Deeds done in his mortal Body. But the Happiness or Misery of a Soul in a State of Separation from the Body has no more Connexion with the Circumstances of such a Judgment, than it has with the Promises and Threatnings of the Law of *Moses*. Such Happiness or Misery is as distinct from, and as contrary to the Happiness or Misery of the latter Dispensation as of the former. And the reasonable Presumption is, that such an intermediate State is revealed under *both* Dispensations, or under *neither*.

But this Revelation Mr. G. will not surely pretend to find in these few Texts he has cited from

Words had been *Αμην λεγω σοι οτι σημερον*—e. q. f. *Verily I say unto thee THAT to-day, &c.* which indeed leaves no Room for any Construction but that in our common Books.

I am not Critic enough to know how far the *Syriac* Version is to be depended upon in general with respect to its Deviations from the received *Greek* Text; (which by the way are neither few nor inconsiderable) but in the present Case its Authority cannot be very decisive; since according to *Tremellius*, the Word *οι* which we read immediately before *σημερον*, *Luke* xix. 9, is wholly omitted in the *Syriac*, though the corresponding Word *καθολι* in the latter Clause of the Verse, plainly requires that it should be expressed. Mr. G. perhaps may now see that the Espousers of the Construction he ridicules so wantonly, are not so much *gravel'd* as he may imagine, and that the *Absurdity* and want of Scholarship he mentions may belong to some Body else.

Having now paid our due Respects to Mr. G's Text and his several Comments upon it, we proceed to consider his other Testimonies.

“ In the Old Testament indeed, says Mr. G.
 “ there are but few Passages to be met with for
 “ our Purpose, and those not so full and direct
 “ to the Point in Hand, as that much greater
 “ Number which the New abounds with. And
 “ no Wonder, since the Law of *Moses* was
 “ founded wholly on temporal Sanctions; where-
 “ as the Gospel was established upon better Pro-
 “ mises, and Life and Immortality could not
 “ have been said to be brought to Light by the
 “ Gospel, if they had been clearly and fully re-
 “ vealed by the former Dispensation (u).”

(u) Serm. p. 13.

But here we must take the Freedom to remind Mr. G. that the Life and Immortality brought to Light by the Gospel, was *that* Life and Immortality *only* which will succeed a general Resurrection; and which was evidenced and insured to Mankind by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. And therefore whatever was true concerning any intermediate Life of the Soul in a State of Separation from the Body, might safely be revealed *before* the Gospel without any Diminution of, or Derogation from the Light peculiar to it.

If Mr. G. by saying that *the Law of Moses was founded on temporal Sanctions only*, means to insinuate that the Revelation of an intermediate State of Happiness and Misery for departed Souls would have clashed with the Sanctions of the *Mosaic* Dispensation; I answer that the very same Inconvenience would arise from the Revelation of such a State under the Gospel. The Sanctions of the Gospel are Rewards and Punishments in a future State (not where the Soul exists separately from the Body, but) where the body will be raised to a new Life, and the compound Man so reanimated brought to a Judgment which will have respect alone to the Deeds done in his mortal Body. But the Happiness or Misery of a Soul in a State of Separation from the Body has no more Connexion with the Circumstances of such a Judgment, than it has with the Promises and Threatnings of the Law of *Moses*. Such Happiness or Misery is as distinct from, and as contrary to the Happiness or Misery of the latter Dispensation as of the former. And the reasonable Presumption is, that such an intermediate State is revealed under *both* Dispensations, or under *neither*.

But this Revelation Mr. G. will not surely pretend to find in these few Texts he has cited from

the Old Testament ; the *gathering* and *going down one to another* mentioned in them being quite indiscriminate without any respect to Good or Evil ; a Representation only of the general State of the Dead, and just as applicable to their Bodies as their Souls. As for his acute Questions, “ Can “ the thing which is not, be said to be gathered to the thing which is not ? Or can nothing “ be said to go to nothing (v) ? ” We think they concern *Solomon* as much to the full as any one else, who in a citation brought by Mr. G. the very next line but one, talks of *the Dust returning to the Earth* ; that is, I suppose, according to Mr. G’s Ideas, of *nothing* returning to *nothing*.

Mr. G. indeed would make *Solomon* tells us “ of two different *Natures* in Man, and of assigning one of these *Natures* to a State of Happiness or Misery immediately upon its Separation from the other (w). ” But *Solomon* was wiser than to talk of what he knew nothing of ; and no man but one who pretends to be wiser than *Solomon*, would venture to tell us what *Solomon* should have said, where *Solomon* himself is silent.

Mr. G. opens his Proofs from the New Testament with the Story of the rich Man and *Lazarus*, Luke xvi. 19. (x), where the first remarkable Things we meet with in the intermediate State supposed to be there represented, are *Souls* with *Fingers* and *Tongues*,—*Souls* liable to the *Torments* of *Fire* and *Refrigerations* of *Water*.

To avoid this Incongruity, we are told that some Parts of this Parable are of the *figurative* and *Scenical* kind. It had been much to Mr. G’s Purpose to have told us what Parts of this, or indeed any other Parable are *not* of the *figurative*

(v) Serm. p. 14. (w) Ibid. (x) P. 15.

and scenical kind. It is upon Account of the Figure and Scenery that runs through all Parables that we object to their being brought in Proof either of real Facts or positive Doctrines. Because such Discourses, so far as they are figurative and scenical must likewise be fictitious.

“ But, says Mr. G. the main Scope and Design of *this* Parable can be no other than to shew that there is a Place of Joy and Comfort for the Righteous and another of Torment for the Wicked, to which they will be *instantly* conveyed upon their Departure out of this World.” Meaning, as I suppose, that this *instantaneous* Conveyance is *not* scenical, whatever the rest may be.

If this be so, Mr. G. must have explained the Evangelist very ill. For he tells us that the rich Man lift up his Eyes in the Place of Torment (or *Hades*) *no sooner* than he was *buried*, which, considering the State and Opulence of the Man in his Life time, would hardly be the Instant he expired. I remark this only to convince Mr. G. that before he can accommodate St. *Luke's* Language to his own Ideas, he will have just as much Occasion for *Figure* and *Scenery* in *this* Part of the Parable as in any other.

Again, If you take even the plainest Part of the Parable *literally*, it will imply that *Moses* and the Prophets taught a future State of Rewards and Punishments as the direct and proper Sanctions of that Dispensation under which they ministered. This we know Mr. G. will not allow, nor indeed is it true. Our Saviour therefore in this Place must be understood to consider *Moses* and the Prophets, not according to their original Designation, but under the actual Capacity in which they were of teaching a future State *at that particular Time*; namely, under the Capacity of School-

masters to bring the *Jews* unto *Christ*, by whom Life and Immortality were fully and perfectly revealed, and made the Sanctions of a new Dispensation (y).

In one Word the plain Tenor of this Narrative is to convince the *Jews* by a scenical Representation adapted to their own Conceptions, that the Lot of the Righteous and Wicked after Death is finally and irrevocably determined, (a Circumstance, by the Way, very unfavourable to the Notion of an intermediate State) and that the Means of Salvation they had already in their Hands were so full and sufficient for the Purpose, that if they would not believe and repent upon the prevailing Motives and Inducements already afforded them, neither would they be persuaded, though an eye-witness of the Happiness and Misery of a future State were to rise from the Dead, and testify unto them the things that he had seen and heard. And the Moral of the Parable being so very obvious, of what Importance was it, whether the Scenery was borrowed from a State of Things then subsisting, or from one to be realized hereafter? If the Instruction was conformed to the Ideas of the *Jews* in order that they might profit by it for the present, what Matter whether those Ideas were mistaken Ideas or not?

It is in vain therefore for Mr. G. to argue that
 “ if *Christ* had only intended to describe that
 “ State of Happiness and Misery which will not
 “ commence till the Resurrection, that Part of
 “ the Parable which plainly supposes the Resur-
 “ rection not yet come, could only serve to con-
 “ found and mislead his Hearers (z);” for how

(y) *Gal.* iii. 24. comp. *Rom.* x. 4. *John* v. 46.

(z) *Pag.* 16.

easy is it to turn his own Artillery upon him, and to say, " If Christ had only intended to describe that intermediate State of Happiness and Misery which is peculiar to the purely immaterial Principle in Man; that Part of the Parable which represents conscious Beings in this intermediate State as having bodily Parts and Passions, could only serve to confound and mislead his Hearers, &c.?" Does he think his Opponents will not take Advantages to which they have an equal Right with himself?

The next Testimony for an intermediate State, is brought by Mr. G. from *Matth. x. 28.* *Fear not them which kill the Body but are not able to kill the Soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both Body and Soul in Hell.* In answer to the Objection drawn from this Passage, the learned Author of the *Appendix* had said, " This only points out the Distinction between this and the next Life, when Soul and Body are reunited, and future Punishments commence (a)." This Sense of the Words Mr. G. treats as "unnatural --- thrown out merely to supply the Want of something better to offer---the Effect of a violent Hurry to get rid of a Text which so utterly confounds those who are of the Opinion contrary to his (b)."

Well then, what is Mr. G's Sense of these Words? Why he tells us that, " our Lord here plainly declares, that the Soul will subsist and live after its Separation by Death from the Body." And does not our Lord as plainly declare in the latter Part of the Verse (which Mr. G. hath wisely drop'd, tho' perhaps not in so violent a Hurry) that the Body will subsist

(a) *Append.* p. 391.

(b) *Serm.* p. 16.

and live after its Separation by Death from the Soul? For I suppose Mr. G. himself would not make the Difference here intimated between the Power of God and the Power of Man to consist in the Circumstance of destroying a *dead Carcase* in Hell. There is therefore a *Body* as well as a *Soul* which cannot be killed by Man. Consequently the *Soul* mentioned in the former Part of the Verse may not mean a *Substance wholly separable from and independent of the Body*, but merely that *future Life* destined to the compound Man at the Resurrection, when his Life or Death will be wholly taken out of the Power of his Fellow-creature, and remain in the Power of God alone.

And this we shall have the greater Reason to believe was our Lord's Meaning when we consider the parallel Place, *Luke xii. 4, 5. Be not afraid of them that kill the Body, and after that, have no more that they can do; but I will forewarn you whom you shall fear; fear him who after he hath killed, hath Power to cast into Hell.* Here is no mention of the Soul's subsisting after its Separation from the Body; no Mention of any thing after Death but the *casting into Hell*; which it is plain does not happen till that which had been killed, *viz. the Man*, is put into some new Capacity of Suffering, or, in other Words, is once more become a *living Soul*.

The whole Force of Mr. G's Reasoning then depends upon the mere Supposition that our Saviour meant the same Thing by $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ that he does by *Soul*. But allowing Mr. G's Notions concerning the human Soul to be right, is he sure our Translators are right in giving the Word *Soul* as the proper *English* of $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$? Certain it is the same Translators have given another Word
for

For ψυχῆν at V. 39 of this same Chapter; being conscious, we may suppose, that the Word *Soul*, as Mr. G understands it, and as they themselves probably understood it, would have a strange Effect in that Passage; for thus would the Verse have run, *He that findeth his Soul shall lose it; and he that loseth his Soul for my sake shall find it.* Where, by *losing the Soul* for the sake of Christ, is plainly meant the exposing the *Soul* to all Manner of Hardships and Sufferings, and even to Death itself for the sake of the Gospel. The Consequence of which would be (however Mr. G. may ridicule the Inference in his Adversaries) that the *Soul* might be killed, and by the very same People too who were able to kill the *Body*. What is it then that makes *Life* the properer and more intelligible Word for ψυχῆν in this 39th Verse, but that you are at Liberty to understand it of *Life* in two different Respects? namely, of *Life* or the *living Man* with respect to *this* World in the first Member of each Clause; and of *Life* or the *living Man* with respect to a *future* World, in the second?

Let our Lord then have the Benefit of explaining his own Meaning by his own Expressions, and you will be incumbered with none of Mr. G's imaginary Absurdities about killing Souls in this 28th Verse, but have this plain and easy Sense; "Fear not those who kill the mortal
 " Body, or extinguish the present Life of Man,
 " but are not able to kill, extinguish, or destroy
 " his future Life; but rather fear God who hath
 " both the present and future Life of every
 " Man absolutely in his Power."

It will probably be said that very good Authors often use the same Word in two different Senses, and why not St. *Matthew*? I answer, because
 cause

cause the same Reasons for such different Usage of *this* Word in St. *Matthew*, cannot be given, that may be given for the different Usage of the same Word in other Authors. The Word *Soul* occurs twice in this 28th Verse, and undoubtedly in the very same Sense in both places, as appears from its being used in contradistinction to *Body* in both. But the Idea of destroying a *Soul* in *Gehenna* is full as discordant with Mr. G's Definition of *Soul*, as it would be to put *Soul* in the 39th Verse, instead of *Life*. Whence it is reasonable to conclude that *Soul* in the former Part of the 28th Verse cannot have the Signification which Mr. G. contends for.

Indeed the Liberties our Translators have taken with the Word $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ are quite unaccountable; particularly *Matth.* xvi. 25, 26. where this Presence of a double Signification can have no Place.

Whosoever, say they, will save his Life [$\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$] shall lose it: And whosoever will lose his Life [$\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$] for my sake shall find it. For what is a Man profited if he shall gain the whole World and lose his own Soul [$\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$] or what shall a Man give in Exchange for his Soul. [$\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ s again.]

Here it is manifest that our Lord is speaking of $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ under one and the same Idea in both Verses. And what Reason could the Translators have to render it by two different Words, but an unwarrantable Inclination to accommodate our Saviour's Language to their own System? Had they dealt impartially with the sacred Text, they must either have put *Soul* in the 25th Verse, or *Life* in the 26th. Try the Experiment either Way, and it will soon be seen how little *Matth.* x. 28. is for Mr. G's Purpose.

Our

Our Author goes on. " The same blessed
 " Jesus when he was expiring on the Cross, re-
 " commends his departing Soul to God in this
 " solemn Form, *Father, into thy hands I commend*
 " *my Spirit* (a). Here, *we are told*, our Sa-
 " viour's Soul is solemnly recommended to God
 " by himself, in Confidence that it would continue
 " in God's Hands, and be preserved and cherished
 " by him, till he should send it back again to its
 " former Habitation."

Perhaps it may be remembered, that when Mr. G. had the Case of the penitent Thief under Consideration, the Doctrine was, that our Saviour's Soul went instantly into *Paradise* upon its separation from his Body; and that *Paradise* is an intermediate State appointed for the Reception of the departed Souls of *all* good Men whatsoever. When therefore Mr. G. talks of " our Saviour's
 " Soul being preserved and cherished in the
 " Hands of God till it was sent back to its
 " former Habitation," how are we to understand him? For my own part I cannot conceive how a Soul can be said to continue in the Hands of God, and be by him preserved and cherished for a certain Season, without being with God in the highest Heaven for that Season. And yet Mr. G. assures us, that our Lord was not with God in the highest Heaven *in his human Nature* till after his Ascension. Here is then, to say the best of it we can, a strange Incongruity of Expression, which ought to be reconciled. For by the naked Terms of these two Descriptions of the state of our Saviour's Soul, we are naturally led to imagine either that there are *two* intermediate States, to *both* which our Saviour's Soul was consigned

(a) *Luke xxiii. 46. apud Serm. p. 18, 19.*

at the same Time ; or that our Saviour had *two* Souls (corresponding to his *two* Natures) *one* which went into *Paradise*, the common Receptacle of the departed Souls of all good Men ; *another* which was more especially recommended into the Hands of God, for some particular Privileges not to be conferred in a common intermediate State.

But the Truth is, Mr. G. did not puzzle himself and his Hearers by Design. The Translators have here once more misled him. For instead of that solemn Recommendation of our Saviour's Soul to GOD which *their English* Word put into his Head, the plain Greek Words are only these, Πατερ, εις χειρας σου παραδισκομαι το πνευμα μου, literally, *Father, into [or in] thy Hands I will depofite my Spirit or Breath* ; importing only our Lord's readinefs to lay down his Life, in consequence of the *Command* he had received from the Father, *John* x. 18. *to lay down his Life, that he might take it again.*

The Expression of the dying Martyr *Stephen, Lord Jesus, receive my Spirit*, *Acts* vii. 59. is much to the same Effect, as if he had said, *Lord Jesus accept (b) the Sacrifice of my Life which*

(b) The learned Author of the *Appendix*, seems, by the Passages he has cited to explain it, not to understand this Text as I do. What inclines me to give this Paraphrase to *Stephen's* Words, is, that the Verb *δεχομαι* with its Compounds and Derivatives, is of frequent and familiar use in the *Greek* Scriptures for that *Acceptance* with which Almighty God honours those Sacrifices, Offerings, and Gifts which are well pleasing to him. Of which, among many others, these Instances may be given. *Exod.* xxviii. 38. *Levit.* i. 3, 4. xix. 5—7. xxii. 19, 20, 21, 23. 25. 27. xxiii. 11. *Deut.* xxxiii. 11. 16. 23. *Judges* xiii. 23. *Job* viii. 20. *Pfalm* l. 9. *Prov.* xi. 1. xii. 22. xv. 8. *Isai.* lvi. 7. lx. 7. *Jer.* vi. 20. *Ezek.* xx. 40, 41. xliii. 27. *Amos* v. 22. *Malachi* i. 8. 10. 13. ii. 13. *Acts* x. 35. 2 *Cor.* vi. 17. *Philip.* iv. 18. 1 *Tim.* v. 4.

I now lay down for thy Sake. If this will not satisfy Mr. G. but he shall still insist that this receiving the Spirit of *Stephen* is to be understood of the actual receiving of his Soul by *Christ*, we shall presently see that this Sense will carry us far beyond the Confines of an intermediate State.

The next Passage which Mr. G. brings in Proof of his Doctrine of an intermediate State, is *Phil. i. 23, 24.* where St. *Paul* says, *I am in a Strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ which is far better : nevertheless to abide in the Flesh is more needful for you (c).*

Here it was Mr. G's Business to shew, that *Paul* wished to be in an intermediate state of Happiness, such as Mr. G. contends for, and that this was what the Apostle meant by desiring to be *with Christ*. But instead of entering on this Disquisition, our Author falls to declaiming on the Impropriety of *Paul's* preferring a state of Insensibility for an Interval of so many Ages, to Life, and Thought, and the Comforts of God's Grace on Earth, &c. All which proves nothing but Mr. G's extreme unwillingness to engage with the rational and judicious Explanation given of this and some parallel Texts by the Author of the *Appendix*, he would be understood to oppose.

Mr. G. I am afraid, by laying so great a stress on the *Length* of the Interval between Death and the Resurrection, intended to lead the Imaginations of his Audience to some frightful Prospect of a long Night of uncomfortable Darkness, which however indifferent it may be to the Dead, is apt to disquiet the Living with some degree of Terror and Anxiety. Whereas had he told them, what

is the honest Truth, and what he himself has not the Courage to disown, that an insensible Clod cannot have the least Idea of any Difference between the Length of an Interval of Ten thousand Years, and the Length of half a Second of Time ; or had he only informed them that *Paul* himself speaks of the coming of Christ, and consequently of the Resurrection of the Dead, as Events that were *at hand* (*d*), the magic Spell of his Oratory had been broke at once, and his Hearers would probably have perceived that this *Desire to depart* carried *Paul* not only beyond a state of Insensibility, but even beyond the Pleasures and Comforts of an intermediate State.

But let us take our Author in his own Way, and inquire what he would have us understand by *being with Christ*. And from this Expression he says, “ We may conclude that good Men in “ this [intermediate] State will, *in some particular* “ *Sense*, be *with Christ*, will be under his continual Care and Protection, and will even enjoy “ the Sight of Him, *by way of Vision and Revelation*, as He was made known to *Abraham* “ and the old Prophets, though in a much more “ perfect Manner (*e*).”

How cautiously and ambiguously is this worded, in comparison of what we meet with when *Paradise* was under Consideration ? — But let us put a short Question upon this obscure state of the Case. Would this, does Mr. G. think, have satisfied St. *Paul*’s Desire ? — This *something* between being *with* and *not with* Christ ? — Between being with him *in a Vision*, and *not in a Vision* ? I hardly be-

(*d*) Concerning these Expressions of St. *Paul*, and the other Apostles, see Dr. *Law*’s Considerations, p. 144, 145. 3d Edit.

(*e*) *Serm.* p. 23.

lieve it would. And if not, we may be under the unwelcome Necessity of concluding that *St. Paul*, in this Passage, expressed an earnest desire to depart and to be conveyed immediately to the Region of supreme Happiness *in the highest Heaven*. For where was Christ when *St. Paul* was in this Strait? Undoubtedly in *that Heaven*, and at the Right Hand of God: a Situation far above the Happiness of an intermediate State, as *Mr. G.* himself hath testified.

For, says *Mr. G.* “our Lord could not consistently with Truth tell the Thief that he should that Day be with him in the highest Heaven, since he himself was not there in his Human Nature till after his Ascension (*f*).” — If you ask, where was he then between his Death and his Resurrection? *Mr. G.* answers, In *Paradise*, or an intermediate State, between which and the highest Heaven there is, according to *Mr. G.* a wide difference in the measure and degree of Felicity appropriated to each.

One might ask *Mr. G.* how he comes to know all this? But we will put the Question in another Form. How came *Mr. G.* to be so very clear and positive concerning *Paradise* when he was commenting on *Luke xxiii. 43.* and so mysterious and indeterminate upon *Phil. i. 23, 24*?

Perhaps the Case might be this. The Thief must either be really and *literally* with Christ in some state of conscious Being, which was *not* the state of supreme Felicity, and on that very Day too when the Promise was made, or all that *Mr. G.* was endeavouring to build upon this Text, would inevitably fall to the Ground. But by that time he got within sight of these Verses in

Philippians, he began to perceive that if he carried the like literal Construction to the Case of *St. Paul*, he might come to have *two* intermediate States upon his Hands, which was by no means convenient. And a Coalition of the two Cases upon his avowed Principles was impossible. For to be with Christ *before* and *after* his Ascension; could never be reconciled to any *one* state of Being, but that of supreme Happiness, with which *Paradise* in that case, would coincide, and to this Coincidence the Promise of the penitent Thief must be accommodated accordingly.

What Mr. G. then had to do here, was to suppose the very thing in question; to declaim upon the eligibility of an intermediate State, before a state of Insensibility; to appear to say something to the positive Part of the Apostle's Desire, while he really said nothing; and by a Cloud of unmeaning Words to prevent us from perceiving that the Apostle might desire something more eligible than either of the States he had been comparing together.

I have now only to observe farther, that if *Stephen's* dying Address to Christ, *Acts* vii. 59. be understood as a Petition, that his Soul might be received by Christ and *continue* with him, as Mr. G. explains it, *His* Case will be incumbered with the very same Difficulties that intangle that of *St. Paul*. And whatever Solution may be found to reconcile one of them to Mr. G's Doctrine of an intermediate State, will likewise disengage the other. And there, for the present, we leave them both.

Thus have we gone through all Mr. G's *Scripture-Proofs of an intermediate state of Happiness or Misery, between Death and Resurrection*. Whether he has proved his Point, we are not to pronounce.

But

But there is one thing of which we apprehend many of the Readers of his Sermon may have taken some particular Notice. And that is, that all these Proofs relate to an intermediate state of Happiness *only*, save one in the Parable of the Rich Man and *Lazarus*, which not agreeing with the Notion of a *Soul* in a state of Separation from the *Body*, is immediately evaporated into Figure and Scenery.

To supply this Defect, Mr. G. proposes that we should infer an intermediate state of Misery from an intermediate state of Happiness, by way of *Analogy*, or *Parity of Reason*: In which proposal I, for my own Part, shall be very ready to oblige him, if Mr. G. will produce any one Text of Scripture in which either a probable Reason of or any good Use is assigned for an intermediate state of Happiness; nay, I think I may venture to make the same Promise in case Mr. G. can only *invent* such a Reason or Use which shall be perfectly consistent with, and is not already assigned for and appropriated to a future state of Rewards at the Resurrection of the Just. Such a Reason, or such an Use (which would take in the Circumstances of *all* good Men) being once assigned, we might possibly have some Groundwork whereon to frame an analogical Argument for an intermediate state of Misery for the Wicked. But while no such general Reason or general Utility can be found for an intermediate state of Happiness, the Proofs brought by Mr. G. (even if we could possibly allow them to *be* Proofs of the Fact) would only relate to a few Cases special and peculiar to the Parties respectively concerned, and resolvable only into the *good Pleasure of God*, without any shadow of a Reason but what is hidden in the impenetrable Depths of his secret Counsels.

And

And upon such Reason or Reasons who can pretend to frame *Analogies*?

It might have been reasonably expected that something should have been said in a Discourse on this Subject, to those Texts which seem to bear the hardest on the Doctrine of an intermediate state of Happiness or Misery for the human Soul in a state of Separation from the Body. This Mr. G. declines, on the pretence that neither the Nature nor the Limits of a Sermon would admit of it. But surely the Plan of a Sermon, as well as of any other Discourse, is in the Author's own Power; and as the adverse Party had brought a formidable number of Scriptures to support his Opinion, and had moreover pleaded that the whole Tenor of the Gospel-Revelation runs in the same strain, the consideration of six or seven detached Texts, which *seem* to have a sound the contrary way, can never be supposed to answer the End of a full and effectual Confutation of him.

Indeed Mr. G. has furnished his Disciples with an Observation which, he thinks, will obviate the Force of most of the Conclusions drawn from Scripture in favour of the Opinion of the Soul's sleeping from Death to the Resurrection. And that Observation is, that "Man, being a Person compounded of two different Natures — it is no wonder that the Scriptures, when they are speaking of the state of the Dead, should sometimes affirm such things of the whole Man, as are only applicable to one part of him, *viz.* his Body (g)." By which, I suppose, Mr. G. means, that when the Scriptures speak of dead and dying Men as *sleeping, falling asleep, &c.* they

are to be understood only of the Sleep of the Body.

Now if the Scriptures had been as explicit concerning these two *different* Natures in Man, as Mr. G. is, we might have admitted the Truth and Propriety of his Observation with less reluctance; but as we cannot find any such distinction as this so much as hinted at; or that, when the Scriptures speak of a Man's *sleeping in Death*, they ever make the least mention of any part of him being awake, we justly suspect the Observation is not well grounded. In the mean time there is an Observation on the other hand, which is sufficiently notorious to every Reader of the Scriptures, namely, that the Words *σὰρξ, σῶμα, ψυχή, πνεῦμα*, &c. which, according to the popular Notion of *Man*, are supposed to denote but *one* part of him, are not only *sometimes*, but very frequently used promiscuously to describe the whole Compound Man, whether living or dead.

Mr. G's concluding *Reflections*, which stand in the place of Inferences, are the next things to be considered.

“ He says first, that it appears from what he
 “ has advanced, how false and groundless the
 “ popish Doctrine of Purgatory is, which, he
 “ observes, is as effectually confuted by his Doc-
 “ trine, as by the contrary Opinion (b).”

That's much indeed. The Doctrine of no intermediate State at all, admits not of the least pretence for a Purgatory, or any other popish *Bubble* of that sort, by not leaving one Saint in *Paradise* to be prayed to, nor one Sinner in the lower Regions to be prayed for. Whereas an actual intermediate State, and that too proved

(b) P. 25, 26.

from Scripture, but where no *precise Nature or Degrees of Happiness or Misery* are ascertained in Scripture or elsewhere, [See *Serm.* p. 22.] leaves Room for all that the wild Fancies and Inventions of Men can possibly imagine concerning the *Circumstances* of such a State.

Well, but his Reason. “ Because, says Mr. G. such tormenting Fires (as Purgatory supposes) are no less incompatible with a State of Happiness immediately following Death, than with a State of downright Insensibility.”

But what then? Has not Mr. G. his intermediate State of *Misery* as well as Happiness, “ where the Wicked are incessantly tormented, &c.?” With this Disadvantage indeed on the Part of Mr. G. that whereas the Papist makes his intermediate Torment a Means of Purgation, and of introducing his Sinner to final Pardon and Peace, and so has a plausible Use for it; Mr. G. torments *his* Souls without any Sort of Utility either to themselves or others, even for the mere sake of tormenting them. And all this not only for a long Interval of many Ages, but before their Cause is determined or even heard. For he himself says, that these miserable Souls shall not be doomed to their final Fate (and consequently not tried or convicted) till the last Day (*i*).

In the mean Time, be it noted that Mr. G’s Doctrine leaves the Papists in full and quiet Possession of all their *interceding* Saints; and tho’ perhaps it might be a disputable Point between him and them in what particular Mansions of Felicity *Peter* and *Paul* have their Residence; yet, being, according to Mr. G. *with Christ in some*

particular Sense, and even enjoying the Sight of him, the Papists will take leave to conclude that they are *in some particular Sense* with the Father too; and consequently in a sufficient Capacity to offer up their Petitions to the Throne of Grace.

And here it may be proper to declare, that if it were only for the sake of this great Corruption of the Christian Doctrine of *one* Mediator, I should not be one of those who draw the Conclusion mentioned in Mr. G's second Reflection: Namely, "that it is a Point of no Consequence which of the two Doctrines be received as the true one;" the Doctrine of the *Sermon*, or the Doctrine of the *Appendix*. The very Vitals of Popery chiefly subsist by this Doctrine of an intermediate State. Take away this Doctrine, and you lay the grand Fabrick of that Church in Ruins. If you leave it with them, and especially if you leave it upon a Scriptural Foundation, you will find your Difficulties greatly increased whenever you attempt to demolish what they think fit to build upon it, be it ever so ridiculous or extravagant. One need go no farther than this very Sermon for an Instance. What a miserably trifling Confutation of Purgatory is here! An intermediate State of Torments cannot be an intermediate State of Happiness! Why no, I suppose the Papists themselves will not pretend to it. But if an intermediate State of Torments may *not* be *infer'd* from an intermediate State of Happiness, what becomes of Mr. G's *Analogy* and *Parity of Reason*? And then again, as Mr. G. has furnished his intermediate State of Happiness with certain Portions of *Divine Grace*, let him put it to what Use he pleases, He will leave the Papists at Liberty to find something *ana-*
F
logous

logous to it for an intermediate State of Misery. And when to this it is added that no Lights are given in Scripture concerning the precise Nature and Degrees of Happiness and Misery in this State, but that Men are left to circumstantiate the general Fact supposed to be revealed in the Scripture, according to their own Fancies and Imaginations, Mr. G. will find that *Purgatory*, *Saint-worship*, *Transmigration*, and a thousand other Fooleries will stick to his System like the Leprosy ; and are never to be wholly discarded but by renouncing the System itself (k).

Mr.

(k) It is but Justice to observe that this Reflection concerns Mr. G. only in common with other Writers on the Subject. Bishop Burnet in particular is greatly embarrassed between his Endeavours to get rid of a *Purgatory*, and to retain an *intermediate State*. Upon the 22d Article he says, " The Scripture speaks to us of *two States* after this Life—
 " *everlasting Happiness* for good Men, and *everlasting Punishment* for the Wicked ;—without the least Hint of any
 " middle State after Death, for Men too good to be damned,
 " but not good enough to be immediately saved." And yet in the very next Page we are told that, " some, upon
 " *very good Grounds*, have though that the Blessed, though
 " admitted to Happiness immediately upon their Death,
 " yet were not so compleatly happy as they shall be *after*
 " the Resurrection." These *probable Grounds*, are two or three Texts of Scripture to which he just before refers. Here then we have a *third State* after Death, which, though not precisely *the middle State* his Lordship would avoid, is surely a *middle State* between this present Life and *everlasting Happiness*, of which no satisfactory Account can be given, unless you will suppose these *Blessed* not good enough to be *immediately saved*; (for *Salvation* and *eternal Life* or *everlasting Happiness* are in the N. T. equivalent Terms ;) a Notion, which, as we have seen, will equally favour a popish *Purgatory*. But however the good Bishop makes us ample Amends in what follows: " And in this, says he, there
 " arose a Diversity of Opinions, which is very natural to
 " all who will go and form *Systems* out of some general
 " Hints." Of these Systems he proceeds to give a particular

Mr. G. and I are here so far of the same Side, that he thinks it of Consequence too that one of these Opinions should be espoused rather than the other, tho' he as good as acknowledges, that
 “ on the Philosophical State of either Doctrine,
 “ the Moment of our Death and that of our
 “ entring on Reward or Punishment, will be
 “ immediately connected.”

For what Reason then, does the Reader imagine, may Mr. G. think it of Consequence to adhere to *his* Side of the Question? Why, “ because it is the Side to which the *Imaginations* of the People incline, and because the Behaviour of the People is much more influenced by the Workings of their Imaginations, than by the real Nature of Things; so that no Reason, no Philosophy (he might if he had pleased have added, no Scripture) will prevail on them to consider two Things as alike indifferent, which their *Imaginations* represent to them as of very unequal Importance (1).”

So then the Doctrine of an intermediate State is of Consequence, because the Populace *imagine* it to be the true Doctrine, and when they take such Fancies into their Heads, seeing that no Reason, no Philosophy, no Scripture will convince them, you must make what you can of their *Imaginations*, humour them in their Notions, and try what Influence you can have with them that Way.

Miserable State of Things, when these become the Maxims of *Christian* Teachers! when the

cular Detail; whence we learn how naturally, when the Trap-door of an intermediate State was once opened, Men drop'd into Purgatories of various Kinds and Denominations.—See Burnet's *Expos.* xxxix. Art. Edit. Folio. p. 220, 221, 222.

(1) Serm. p. 26, 27.

Ministers of Him *who came to bear witness unto the Truth*, and to set all Men free by the Light of it, are obliged to put this Light under a Bushel, lest it should offend the vitiated Optics of Men used to sit in Darkness, and when they who should be the Light of the World themselves are forced to steer their own Course by the Glimmerings of other Men's *Imaginations* !

And yet this Expedience of humouring the People, is, I'm afraid, the very best Plea that Protestant Churches have to offer for declining to review their old Systems, and to cast out of them all Things that offend, and which upon Examination should be found to be in no good Agreement with the written Word. 'Tis dangerous, they say, to unsettle Mens Minds, and divert them from the Paths wherein they have been accustomed to walk. But why was not this a Consideration with our Saviour and his Apostles at the first planting of Christianity ? What Respect do they appear to have paid to Mens ancient Opinions and Prejudices when they were found to deviate from the Truth ? Or what Danger do they seem to have apprehended in bringing Men out of Bondage and Darkness into the Regions of Light and Liberty ? And let me add to this, that if this mean pusillanimous Complaisance for the *Imaginations* of the People had prevailed in these Kingdoms above the Love of Truth, about two hundred Years ago, the Church of *Rome* had still stood where the Church of *England* does now, and might have defended every Error and every Corruption we charge upon her by this very Inexpedience of unsettling Mens Minds, with the same Pertinence and Propriety, and much greater Consistency with themselves, than Protestants can alledge it in any Case.

And

And now I have mentioned the Church, it comes into my Head to put a Question to Mr. G. viz. Upon what Grounds he calls the Doctrine of an intermediate State, *the Doctrine of our Church?* If the Doctrine be true and agreeable to the Scriptures, he may do well enough to *establish* it himself as he *proposes*, at his Entrance upon his Subject. But I cannot find that it is a Doctrine already *established* in the Church of *England*.

The Articles of Religion set forth in the Reign of K. *Edward VI*, were in Number 42 ; of which the 40th ran thus :

“ They who maintain that the Souls of Men
 “ deceased do either sleep without any Manner of
 “ Sense to the Day of Judgment, or affirm that
 “ they die together with the Body, and shall be
 “ raised therewith at the last Day, do wholly
 “ differ from the right Faith and orthodox Bel-
 “ lief which is delivered to us in the Holy Scrip-
 “ tures.”

When the Articles were revised in the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, and reduced to 39, this was one of those that were drop'd. A certain Sign that the Church had *then* altered her Opinion in this Matter, and no longer thought the Doctrine controverted by Mr. G. “ did *wholly* differ from
 “ the right Faith and orthodox Belief delivered
 “ in the Scriptures.”

As to the Passage in the Burial-Office, which affirms that “ the Souls of the Faithful after they
 “ are delivered from the Burden of the Flesh,
 “ are with God in Joy and Felicity,” we must take leave to dispute Mr. G's Claim to it. When it is considered that St. *Paul*, speaking of the State of Man *after* the Resurrection, says that *Flesh and Blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God,*

God(m), and that the same Apostle plainly intimates that the same Period is allotted for the Faithful's being taken to, and continuing *with the Lord (n)*, without mentioning any other; we cannot but think it far more likely that the Compilers of this Service should have these plain Scriptures in their Eye when they pen'd these Expressions, than any rambling Notions of an intermediate State. This however we are sure of, that Mr. G. has made the Church say what she really does not; namely, that this *Joy* and *Felicity* are distinct things from the perfect *Consummation* and *Bliss*, she mentions afterwards.

Where to look for more of the Church's Doctrine on this Head I know not, except in the *Homilies*; and with any thing on this Subject from thence I suppose we shall hardly be pressed. However if I should be mistaken, when any Doctrine there delivered shall make its Appearance in Favour of the adverse Party, we hope we shall have Leave to recruit in the same Quarter, and have no Fear of meeting at least with equal Success.

After all, I hope none of us take the Church of *England* to be infallible. Jokers indeed have been apt to say she is *always in the Right*: But on *this* Article, I have the Satisfaction to inform the Reader that she is not even *explicit*. So that if he can but prevail with his own *Imagination*, He may betake himself to his Bible with all Courage, and form his Opinion of this Point without any Fear of departing from the orthodox Doctrine of the Church of *England*, which way soever he shall find Reason to determine the Question.

(m) 1 Cor. xv. 50.

(n) 1 Thess. iv. 17.

But it was not enough for Mr. G. to overawe his Audience with the Authority of the *Church*, without the Addition of that dirty Piece of Author-craft of stigmatizing the Doctrine he did not like with an heretical By-word. “The “ Doctrine is maintained by the *Socinians*,” says he.—Why aye—and by the *Athanasians* too, as I could shew him to his Satisfaction. So far then the Heretics and the Orthodox are upon a Level.

But does he mean that this is one of the Tenets of the Body of the *Socinians*, and necessarily connected with their avowed System? So indeed it was objected to them by the Faculty of Divinity at *Leyden*, as likewise that they denied the Resurrection of the Wicked. But both these one of their Apologists declared to be Calumnies, and appealed to a Vindication of the Confession of their Faith, which was acknowledged for an authentic Account of their Doctrine by the whole Sect (o).

Had Mr. G. given himself the least Concern to be informed concerning the Principles either of professed *Socinians*, or of those learned Men to whom Socinianism hath been imputed by their splenetic Adversaries, he might easily have seen the Impropriety of his ridiculous Insinuation.

(o) *Bayle's Dict.* Article SOCINUS. Rem. L. cit. 62. 63. This Apologist's Creed concerning the Soul, is expressed in these Words: *Quis non cupiat animas etiam corporibus carentes vivere, agere, intelligere; Dei conspectu et gaudiis cælestibus perfrui; pro nobis, in corpore adhuc, tanquam in carcere agentibus, Deum orare, nostrique curam gerere? Quis non pedibus in hanc Sententiam eat?* Here then we have a *Socinian*, the working of whose *Imagination* is full as favourable to an intermediate State as Mr. G. himself could wish.

Among

Among the latter was the great and good Archbishop *Tillotson*, whose Sermon upon the Eternity of Hell-Torments derived upon him the Title of *Socinian* from the ———s of those Days: nor indeed was it to be denied that the Opinion espoused by the Archbishop in that Sermon was strenuously maintained by *Socinus* and his whole Party. But then on the other hand, who more zealous for the natural Immortality, and consequently the separate Existence of the Soul? Who more averse to, or more ready to confute the Doctrine of the Soul's sleeping between Death and the Resurrection than Archbishop *Tillotson*?

If Mr. G. meant nothing more by this crude Assertion than to pay a Compliment to one or both of the Gentlemen whose Opinions concerning an intermediate State appear in the *Appendix* so often mentioned, by way of recommending them to the Civilities of the Mob; I cannot commend his Forecast any more than his Temper or his Candour.

The common People are apt to take the Measure of their Prejudices for or against particular Persons from the Esteem and Repute such Persons are in with such of their Superiors as are by public Authority set in the Seat of Judgment, and upon whom they will think they may, for that Reason, safely depend.

When therefore it comes to be understood (as it easily may by any Man upon a very little Inquiry) that these two excellent Persons (who never took any Pains that I can hear of to conceal their peculiar Opinions) have had all the Marks of Honour and Esteem bestowed upon them by the most venerable Characters in our established Church, which are consistent with their respective Situations; not to mention the particular and
personal

personal Virtues by which their intrinsic Merit is ascertained, among all those who have the Happiness of a nearer Acquaintance with them;—when these Things, I say, come to be known and understood, and Mr. G's Reflection is brought into Contrast with this high Degree of public Estimation, what will the reasonable Part of Mankind conclude from the whole State of the Case? Certainly either that these worthy Persons are no *Socinians*, or that *Socinianism* is in itself a very innocent Thing, and may be consistent with the highest Degrees of Piety, Learning, personal Integrity, good Sense, Usefulness, and, in one Word, with every Thing which contributes to finish the Character of a truly Christian Divine.

These Things considered, it behoves us, I think, in Prudence to be extremely cautious upon whom we cast these Imputations, if it was only for the sake of our common *Orthodoxy*. But indeed it is not from such Considerations as these alone, that I would if I could discredit the infamous Practice (so common among the Small-craft of controversial Writers) of branding Men with these invidious Names of *Arian* and *Socinian*.

For pray how come these to be Terms of Reproach? Only because the Church, to which you have the good Luck to belong, has procured a different System to be established by Law. You cannot be ignorant that the *Arian* and *Socinian* are as firmly persuaded that your Principles are void of any Foundation in the Scriptures, as you can possibly be that theirs are so; and if either their Interest or their Numbers had been sufficient to intitle them to the Favour of the Magistrate when the Forms of Religion were settled

at the Reformation (*p*), perhaps by this Time the Names of *Athanasian* and *Trinitarian* had been as disreputable as *Arian* and *Socinian* are now.

When the Papist calls you, who are a Protestant, an *Heretic*, does he prove his Point? Do you think he advances one Step towards it? No, you laugh at him; and here in *Britain* you may safely do it. But if he were to call you so in *Spain* or *Portugal*, tho' he could only prove you a Protestant, he would perhaps, in certain Circumstances, frighten you sufficiently. Would then his Cause gain any real Merit by being under the Protection of the secular Arm? or would you think his taking this Advantage, either fair or generous? And is it more fair or more generous in you to call your Adversary *Arian* or *Socinian* in *England*? Can you confute him out of the Scriptures, the common Authority to which you both appeal? If you can, take your Satisfaction in good Time. You have no occasion for any other Weapon. If you cannot, there is no more Argument, Reason, Christianity, common Civility, or common Sense in calling a Man *Arian* or *Socinian* in order to render him obnoxious to the Rulers of the Church of *England*, than there is in the sanguinary Papist's calling you an Heretic in order to expose you to the horrid Cruelties of a popish Inquisition. 'Tis the same Spirit, I fear, that instigates in both Cases.

These Insults are inexcusable in Writers of any Class. But most of all in those, who take Re-

(*p*) To prevent Cavils, it may be just necessary to observe that *Socinus*, tho' he had not begun to figure at the Time of our *English* Reformation, only gave a *Patronymic* to a Collection of Opinions which had been severally maintained by various Heretics long before.

fuge

fuge in this blustering Abuse to screen their own Weakness from the Observation of their Partizans. This, I'm afraid, might in some Measure be Mr. G's Case. And as he had it in his Power, and should in Modesty have made it his Choice to decline all Attempts to clear up a Point, which even his very Friends must acknowledge he neither could manage, nor sufficiently understood; His Rashness and Petulance in treating two eminent and unexceptionable Men with so much Scorn in some Instances, and with so invidious and groundless an Insinuation in this we have just been considering, will, it is hoped, afford some Apology for the Freedoms taken with him in these Papers; for which indeed so much could not have been said, had he entered the Lists with more Candour and less Self-sufficiency, tho' with no better Appointments than this very superficial Performance exhibits.

REMARKS upon a Letter in the Gentleman's
Magazine for April, 1756. Page 173.

MY Business with the Writer of this Letter, who calls himself *J. Ties*, is not to examine his philosophical Arguments for a separate Existence of the Soul taken from the Nature of Time, &c. The Consideration of these I leave to the Gentleman who gave Occasion to them, and who seems to be well qualified to do Justice to the Subject. I shall only consider the Proofs brought by Mr. *Ties* from the Scriptures in Behalf of his Opinion, which he allows ought to be decisive, save only in the Case of *the clearest Demonstration* to the contrary.

What kind of Demonstration Mr. *Ties* would be willing to admit in Contradiction to the Scriptures he hath not said. If the Scriptures determine a Point of this Nature, I should think it in vain to have Recourse to metaphysical Principles, or to rely upon any Deductions from those, tho' ever so demonstrative in a logical Way, for Want of sufficient *Data* concerning the Nature, Substance, Powers, and Capacities of the human Soul considered as a Principle distinct from and independent of the Body. These it will ever be impossible for us to settle otherwise than by the Knowledge of the actual Operations of the Soul in such a State of Independency, which no Man will pretend to on this Side the Grave. The Demonstration then, I suppose, Mr. *Ties* may refer to, is *intuitive* Demonstration, which, as it cannot be had till we have passed through a State of Death! (except by some such extraordinary Genius as that
of

of Mr. *Pope* (q)) we may as well allow the Scriptures to decide the Question for the present without any restriction whatsoever. And thither let us go.

St. *Paul* has said, 2 Cor. v. 1. *For we know that if our earthly House of this Tabernacle were dissolved, we have a Building of God, an House not made with Hands, eternal in the Heavens.*

Mr. *Ties* allows that the House not made with Hands, eternal in the Heavens, is not to be received till the Resurrection; “yet, says he, St. *Paul* must have been very far from meaning that the Resurrection of his Body would be immediately after his Death, since (in the eighth Verse of this same Chapter) he expresses his Expectation both of the Existence and Activity of his Soul in a separate State. *We are confident* (says he) *and willing rather to be absent from the Body and present with the Lord.*”

But whatever St. *Paul* might mean in the first Verse he was very far from meaning in the 8th any such Thing as Mr. *T.* ascribes to him. Go back to the 6th Verse, and take the Context fairly along with you, and you will easily perceive the Apostle is there speaking of *no* separate State, nor of *any* State *after* Death; but of a State of *walking by Faith*, and a State of *walking by Sight before* Death.

Therefore, says he (verse 6th) *we are always confident, knowing that while we are at home in the Body we are absent from the Lord.* Now, if by *being at home in the Body*, the Apostle meant the continuance of his natural Life, as that is opposed

(q) In his more serious Hours he used to say—That he was certain of its Immortality—that he seem'd to *feel* it as it were within him by *intuition*. *Pope's Works*, vol. iv. P. 34.

to a state of Death, what occasion for all this *Confidence* and all this *Knowledge*? For who does *not* know, or who may *not* be confident, that to be present in this Life, is to be absent from another? But, says the Apostle, the reason of this our Confidence and Knowledge is, that *we walk by Faith, and not by Sight* (verse 7th.) This is something; and shews the Apostle's Meaning to be, that while Men live in the Body as if they were *at home* in it, or in other Words, *walk by Sight*, they are, in every Sense, absent from the Lord.

But this was not the Case with *him* and his Fellow-christians, for they *walked by Faith*; and in that Faith were so stedfast, so well confirmed, so confident that (verse 8th) they were (not *willing*, but) *well pleased* (ευδοκουμεν) rather *εχδημηςαι εκ του σωματος*, *to be travelling from the Body*, i. e. to be Aliens or Pilgrims in respect of bodily Enjoyments; και *εχδημηςαι προς τον κυριον* — *to be going homewards to, or towards the Lord* (q).

Here then we see that *Paul* is discoursing of *no* State after Death, but of his spiritual Life on Earth; and is indeed speaking the same Language (with a small variation of the Metaphor) as when he and his Fellow-Apostles talk of Christians *walking not after the Flesh but after the Spirit* — of being *crucified unto the World* — *crucified with Christ* — *but alive unto God through Christ* — of *crucifying the Flesh with the Affections and Lusts* — of *abstaining from fleshly Lusts which war against the Soul*, as being *Strangers and Pilgrims* with respect to the Body, &c.

(q) Hæc duo verba *εχδημηςαι*, *Εχδημουμεν*, hic (*vid.* v. 6.) *commorationem* denotant: at v. 8 ubi commutantur, *profectionem*, says *Bengelius*, Gnom. in loc.

If this does not satisfy Mr. Ties, it will be incumbent upon him to make this 8th Verse consistent with what follows; for the Context does not end here, but goes on thus, v. 9.

WHEREFORE *we labour* (φιλοτιμουμεθα) *that whether present* (ευδημουντες) *or absent* (εκδημουντες) *we may be accepted of him; i. e. of the Lord.*

Now nothing is more manifest in the Scriptures of the New Testament, than that between Death and the Resurrection is no state of *Labour*. *Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, — for they rest from their Labours.* But, according to the Apostle, he *laboured*, being *absent* as well as *present*.

And, therefore, if we are to understand *εκδημουντες* in this 9th Verse, of Souls in a state of Separation from the Body, (as we needs must, if *εκδημησαι εκ τῆς σαρκος*, v. 8. mean a natural Death or departure out of the Body) we shall have Souls in an intermediate state of *Probation*; Souls in a separate State contending with Earnestness and Ambition to render themselves acceptable to God; and by what means? Why, by Labours and Endeavours of which no Account will be taken, or any Inquiry made. For, as it follows immediately, the Deeds for which every one shall receive his *Recompense*, are those only which are done *in the Body*. Is it possible to make the Apostle consistent with the Tenor of other Scriptures, or even with himself, upon this Interpretation of Mr. Ties?

But if you go along with *Paul* in the use of his Metaphor, you will have a natural, easy Sense, not only consistent with, but clearly resulting from the drift of his Discourse in the foregoing part of the Chapter, to this effect.

“ *Wherefore we labour that whether present* (so-
 “ *journing in the Body, according to the Eye of*
 “ *Sense) or absent* (on our Pilgrimage to our
 “ continuing

“ continuing City, according to the Eye of Faith)
 “ *we may be accepted with him* (well pleasing to
 “ him.) *For* (after all, we are so far concerned
 “ with the Body, that) *we must all appear before*
 “ *the Judgment-Seat of Christ to receive the things*
 “ *done in* (or through, *i. e.* by the Instrumenta-
 “ lity of) *the Body: according to what every one*
 “ *hath done, whether it be good or bad.*” v. 10.

Mr. *Ties* will now perceive, that this 8th Verse will not help him out of the Difficulty laid upon his Hypothesis in the first. He discovers, indeed, an inclination to accommodate the first Verse to the Notion of a separate State of the Soul, by a Paraphrase which leaves room for *something* between Death and the Resurrection. We will not differ with him concerning the Accuracy of his Paraphrase, but will suppose the *Corinthians* to have understood St. *Paul* as Mr. *T.* does, and thereupon to have asked him this Question, “ We have now an earthly House or
 “ Tabernacle of Flesh, and you tell us that at
 “ the general Resurrection we shall have a building
 “ of God eternal in the Heavens: But what shall
 “ we have in the mean Time?” “ Why nothing,
 “ (must the Apostle have answered;) you must
 “ be *naked* and *unclothed* till you receive your
 “ Resurrection-Body.” A Circumstance by no means desirable, as the Apostle himself acknowledges (v. 4.) be the mortal Body ever so great an Incumbrance: And, indeed, he excludes the very Supposition of such an *unclothed* State, by intimating that *Mortality shall not be swallowed up of Life*, till the Resurrection-Body is put on.

These Considerations may likewise serve to reconcile Mr. *Ties* to *T. J.*'s Interpretation of *Heb.* ix. 27. namely, that nothing, no active perceptive state of the Soul shall intervene between

Death and the Resurrection. His Objection to it indeed is little more than a quibble upon the Word *immediately*. Allow for the interval of Sleep between Death and Judgment, and all Mr. T's Criticism on the Word *μὲλα* comes to nothing: These are critical Niceties of no great Significance. The question before us must receive its decision from the current Doctrine of the Gospel. If *Paul* did not write this Epistle to the *Hebrews* himself, we know it was written by somebody who taught the same Doctrine, and is as consistent with *Paul* as *Paul* is with himself.

Mr. *Ties* having allowed that the Death denounced upon Man at the Fall was not eternal Punishment, we have no occasion to go along with him into his Refinements on the Case of *Adam*; or to enter with him into Disquisitions, in which we think it impossible for him either to give or receive Satisfaction. 'Tis sufficient for us that the Punishment denounced upon our first Parents is *Death*, a State; which if there are any Rules to fix the Signification of Words, is as different from a state of *Activity* and *Perception*, as Darknesh is from Light.

“ But, says this Gentleman, a state of Insensibility is not a state of Punishment; *Adam*; upon the Supposition that the moment of his Death and the moment of his Resurrection would appear to him the same, would be entirely insensible of his Punishment till it was over,” &c.

Mr. *Ties* then it seems makes no account of the *Accidents* of *Mortality*, the Pain, Sickness and Sorrow to which *Adam* became liable, in consequence of the Sentence of Death passed upon him. He reckons nothing of

————— *the thousand natural Pangs*
That Flesh is Heir to —————

which *Adam* in particular endured during the course of Nine hundred and thirty long Years, and which have heretofore been esteemed no inconsiderable Ingredients of the Punishment implied in the Sentence of Death.

“ But this, we are told, or any other Considerations, will not prove that the Soul, during its Separation from the Body, is in a torpid, inactive State, till it be first proved that no other State would, in this respect, be a Punishment, the contrary of which may be easily shewn.”

He should have said, as the Course of his Argument required, *till it be first proved that no other state of Death would be a Punishment.* The Sentence pronounced upon fallen Man was, that he should die ; this Death was a Punishment, but, as both Sides are agreed, not eternal Punishment. The Case standing thus, to what purpose is it to say, or even to prove, that there may be a state of *Perception* and *Activity*, (a state of *Life* and not of *Death*) which may be as great or a greater Punishment than a state of *Insensibility* ?

’Tis worth the while however, to see how Mr. T. makes out this Point. “ Whereas, says he, supposing his [*Adam’s*] Soul to be sensible and *even happy* in a separate State, God’s deferring so long the completion of its Happiness, cannot fail of being a real Punishment.” That is to say, a Soul may be severely punished, and at the same time extremely happy in an intermediate State. I have some Curiosity to know what Mr. G. would say to this ; for this must be the Case

Case with all *his* good Men as well as *Adam*.
But to proceed with Mr. *Ties*.

The Gentleman who called himself *Philanastasis*, in the *Magazine* for *January*, 1756, observed of our Saviour's Argument to the *Sadducees*, *Luke* xx. 37, 38. " that if it proved the departed Spirits
" of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, to be in a state
" of Activity and Life, it would prove too
" much; for God might then be the God of
" *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, and yet there might
" be no Resurrection of the Dead."

In answer to this, Mr. *Ties* informs us, that
" no Argument for a Resurrection *can* afford a
" Proof of the Soul's sleeping; for no Person who
" disbelieves a Resurrection, *can* believe that the
" Soul exists after Death in a torpid, inactive
" State, and therefore an Argument for the Re-
" surrection, founded on such a Belief, must take
" a thing for granted which the Person it is in-
" tended to convince will never allow."

But supposing the Person intended to be convinced does not believe the separate Existence of the Soul at all? This we certainly know was the Case with the *Sadducees*. And by our Saviour's leaving that Disbelief of theirs untouched, and confining his Argument to a Resurrection *only*, we have sufficient reason to conclude, that he no more believed such a separate Existence than they did. So that both Sides being agreed as to the Torpidity of the Soul, or, if you please, its Non-existence after Death in a natural way, the Argument for a Resurrection had all the Force and Propriety that it was possible to give it.

All therefore that Mr. *T*'s answer to *Phila-nastasis* amounts to is, that he would not have been so soon put to silence by our Saviour's Argument for a Resurrection as the *Sadducees* were,

for that he could have upheld the Dispute by a variety of metaphysical Subtleties concerning the Nature of the Human Soul. And to this he addresses himself in what follows:

“ On the Principles of the *Sadducees*, says he, “ the Resurrection is impossible, and consequently a direct Proof of it to them must have been impracticable. This therefore our Lord “ does not attempt——.”

Amazing! our Lord's Argument is plainly this. “ That God is *able* to raise the Dead you “ cannot deny, that He *will* do it *Moses* has “ shewn you, by recording his Words at the “ Bush.” Does our Saviour argue from any one Circumstance but the *Power* of God, and the *Tenor* of the Scriptures which the *Sadducees* acknowledged? And is it possible for the Mind of Man to conceive a *more* direct Argument than this to the *Sadducees* themselves? Would it not have been full as much to Mr. T's purpose to have observed, that upon the Principles of the *Sadducees*, the Creation of Man is impossible? Where Scripture *Facts* are in question, what have we to do with visionary *Hypotheses*?

“ Our Saviour, says this Gentleman, strikes “ at what he knew to be the root of their [the “ *Sadducean*] Prejudice,” viz. the Non-existence of the Soul in a separate State. Whence does this appear? Whence does it appear that this Prejudice (if a Prejudice it was) was *not* the Prejudice of our Saviour as well as of the *Sadducees*? Without all doubt, if this Prejudice had been in our Saviour's Eye with a view of confuting it, He would have said, *Ye do err, not knowing the nature of the human Soul*. Instead of this he appeals—to what? why to positive Revelation, and the extraordinary Power of God. Would not

not this profound abstracted Philosopher be ready to tell us upon some Occasions, that nothing could be more impertinent than to appeal to *Authority*, when the Question was concerning a Production of *Nature*?

“ Our Saviour’s Argument to the Sadducees
 “ (*Luke xx. 37, 38.*) if it will prove any thing, must,
 “ Mr. *Ties* thinks, prove that the Patriarchs
 “ were in a state of Activity WHEN GOD ap-
 “ peared to *Moses*.” And I will add, that IF it
 proves *that*, it must likewise prove that they were
 THEN in a state of Activity by means of a Re-
 surrection. For of any other state of Activity
 after Death our Saviour makes not the least men-
 tion; nor does he cite this Scripture to prove
 any thing, but that the DEAD ARE RAISED. If,
 therefore, we must adhere to the strictly literal
 Sense in point of *Time*, we must adhere to it
 throughout, that our Interpretation may be all of
 a piece.

But why must we be so literal in Point of *Time*?
 “ Why, if the Maxims, that *one Day is with the*
 “ *Lord as a thousand Years*, and, *he calleth the*
 “ *things that are not as tho’ they were*, be applied
 “ in this Case, they will be far from proving
 “ even the future Activity of the Patriarchs;
 “ since *by the very same License*, God’s calling
 “ himself their God may be understood to refer
 “ to his having been such in their Life-times.”

Very true, if it be admitted that our Saviour
 was liable to be mistaken in his Interpretation of
 what God said to *Moses* at the Bush. For our
 Saviour is very clear that God did not refer to his
 being the God of these Patriarchs in their Life-
 times. Consequently, if we will apply these
 Maxims in *this* Case, it must be to the *future*
 activity of *Abraham, Isaac* and *Jacob* only.

Why

Why then, once more, must we fix this Declaration of Almighty God at the Bush to that point of Time when it was made, rather than refer it to the future Activity of the Patriarchs after the Resurrection? The reason comes at last, and a very curious one it is. “As God,” says this Gentleman, is a relative Term, and “all relation is mutual, Jehovah’s calling himself any Person’s God, must imply, that that Person is in a Capacity for such relation, that is, that he *perceives* and *acts*, or (as our blessed Lord expresses it) that he is not *dead* but *living*.”

So then according to this Philosophy, God was not *Abraham’s* God when *Abraham* was asleep; nor is the God of any Man who is in the Frenzy of a Fever. Nay what is more, by this Rule, the Capacities of Men to fulfill their Relation towards God must, in proportion, either be as constant, uniform and invariable, as the Capacities of God himself are to fulfill *his* Relation to them, or he cannot be called their God. By which equitable Sentence, Infants, Ideots, and numberless Mortals, whose Intellects are either not ripened, or have been impaired, and who perhaps have the greatest occasion for the more especial Protection of God, are at once deprived of it. An Absurdity which might have given the Hint to a less metaphysical Head, that when our Saviour says, *ALL live unto God*, he must be understood of *ALL* who had lived, or should at *any Time* live upon Earth, not those only who were already *dead*, but even those who were yet *unborn*. For they who are *dead* but shall rise again, and they who are yet *unborn*, but shall exist hereafter, are really and in fact no more *incapable* of fulfilling their respective Relations towards

towards God, than they whose Capacities are under a temporary Suspension during their natural Lives. And had this Gentleman given himself leave to consider that the Maxim, as he calls it, which teaches that *God calleth those things which be not as though they were*, is applied by Paul not only to the quickening of the Dead, but to the future Privileges of the unborn Posterity of Abraham, he would probably have perceived that he was only playing an Hypothesis against a Matter of Fact, and in his Zeal to save the Credit of a precarious Philosophy, had quite mistaken the nature of the Evidence which the Scriptures hold forth to Believers.

“ That St. Paul thought it possible, says Mr. Ties, for the Soul to *perceive* and *act* without the Body, is abundantly evident from 2 Cor. xii. 2, 3. where speaking of his being caught up into the third Heaven, he twice repeats these Words, *Whether in the Body or out of the Body I cannot tell, God knoweth.*”

Mr. Ties, as I apprehend, should have stated this Case thus; “ St. Paul thought it possible for the Soul *to be made to perceive and to be acted upon*, without the mediation of the bodily Organs, &c.” For this was probably the Case, not only in *this*, but in other prophetic Visions and Raptures, which are described by *being in the Spirit*, an Expression which will hardly leave room for any *proper* Activity of the Soul. We will, however, allow Mr. T. to make as much as he can of this *Possibility*, desiring only in return, that he will pay equal regard to St. Paul in some other Passages where he expresses himself with more precision, particularly 1 Cor. xv. 16—18. *If the Dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and*

if

if Christ be not raised — then they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished, (ἀπωλοντο.)

How could St. Paul say this, if he believed or even thought that the Souls of these Christians were alive, active and sensible, and would, in their own nature, continue so for ever, whether they should be reunited to their Bodies or not?

I have already said so much on the Parable of the rich Man and *Lazarus* (*Luke* xvi. 19.) that I should not have thought it necessary to add any thing more, had not Mr. T. thought proper to affirm (in support of much the same Arguments which Mr. Goddard builds upon it) “ that *Ades* “ *always* in the New Testament signifies the “ Place or State of separate Spirits.”

But why in the *New Testament* particularly, where both the Name and the Idea of *Hades* wherever it occurs, are most manifestly borrowed, and, in some Passages, expressly cited from the *Old*? And in the *Old Testament* is so far from being appropriated to the Use of *Spirits*, that it signifies neither more nor less than the general Receptacle of the Dead, without specifying any distinction of the Soul from the Body.

Besides; this Observation of Mr. Ties, supposing it to be true, would be a very unfortunate one for his Cause in another respect. Where the Word *Hades* is used figuratively in the New Testament, it signifies a state of utter Ruin and Oblivion, as particularly *Matth.* xi. 23, and xvi. 18. St. Peter, *Acts* ii. 27, quotes a Passage from the 16th *Psalms*, where mention is made of the Soul's being in *Hades*, which in the very next Words is explained to be a state of *Corruption*. For the rest, go to the *Old Testament*; *David* will

will tell you, *Psalms* vi. 5. that in *Hades* there is no remembrance of God. *Solomon*, *Ecclesiastes* ix. 10. is in the same Strain, and advises you to make use of your Time while you are on earth, for that there is no Work, nor *Device*, nor *Knowledge*, nor *Wisdom* in *Hades*, whither you are going. King *Hezekiah* confirms this Opinion of his Predecessors, *Isaiah* xxxviii. 18. and informs you, that they who are in *Hades* cannot praise God nor hope for his Truth. A strange Place surely for active and percipient Spirits, where there is no remembrance, no device [or reasoning, λογισμος] no knowledge, no hope!

It happens indeed most unluckily for Mr. T. that *Hades* cannot possibly signify or represent the State of *separate* Spirits in this very Parable; the Parties concerned appearing in it with the same bodily Members and Sensations, as they had in their Life-time.

We readily acknowledge that there are Circumstances in this Parable which are as little suitable to the state of Things *after* the general Resurrection, as to an intermediate State *before* it; particularly that Part which represents some Persons as still living in this World, when others are consigned to irrevocable Misery. But then we say, it is a *Parable*, composed of a mixture of Images adapted to the gross Conceptions of the Persons for whose Use and Instruction it was intended: And therefore do not pretend to prove any Fact, or confirm any particular Point of Doctrine out of it, other than the plain scope of the Parable evidently suggests.

But Mr. Ties, on his Side, is not willing to part with it so easily: He says, that “ though
“ most of the things related in Parables be purely

I

“ fictitious,

“ fictitious, yet they must *all* be *possible*, and, in
 “ some degree, *probable*.”

And what does he get by this Observation? even this; That it is *possible*, and, in some degree, *probable*, that Souls in a separate State may have bodily Members, Sensations and Affections, — may be tormented by Fire, and cooled and refreshed with Water, just as when they were united to their respective Bodies.

He would indeed turn his Observation another way. He says, “ an active, intermediate State “ is the very foundation of the Parable.” But this is begging the Question. A future state of the righteous and wicked respectively, is indeed the foundation of the Parable. But whether this future State be *intermediate* or *final*, is the Point in debate. This Gentleman thinks he has pointed out a Circumstance which makes it impossible it should represent a *final* State. We think we have pointed out another, which makes it full as impossible it should represent an intermediate State. But then we say, that granting both these *Impossibles*, it is a little too hardy to call the Parable *absurd*, because the important Truths it was intended to convey, namely, the necessity of a timely and effectual Repentance, and the sufficiency of the Means afforded by God, under the *Jewish* as well as the Christian Dispensation, for that Purpose, are easily discernable by the plainest Understanding through all these fictitious Circumstances, which makes the literal Sense impossible.

The Case of the penitent Thief has been sufficiently considered in the former part of this Disquisition. And indeed where a Man is so great a Stranger to the Language of the Scriptures with
 respect

respect to past and future Times as to be capable of saying, that “ when our Saviour says, *To day shalt thou be with me in Paradise*; *To day* can no more mean *Two or Three thousand Years* hence, than *Paradise* can mean *Gehenna* ;” the Pains we have taken to rectify some other of his Mistakes, may be thought by some People not to have been over well laid out.

REMARKS upon a Paragraph in one of Archbishop Tillotson's Sermons.

THE Paragraph which gives Occasion to these Remarks is in the second of those Six Sermons on the Subject of *a religious and divine Faith* preached by this worthy Prelate from *Heb. xi. 6.* and is to be found in the eleventh Volume of his Works published in Octavo, 1744. Serm. ccxx. p. 4892. where the Archbishop having shewn how the Existence of a God may be proved by the Light of Nature, and the Reason of the Thing, goes on thus :

“ As for the other two Principles of natural Religion, the Immortality of the Soul and a future State, after we believe a God, we may be persuaded of these from divine Revelation ; and that doth give us the highest and firmest Assurance of them in the Resurrection of Christ from the Dead.”

Highest and firmest Assurance of THEM ? Of what ? Surely not of the Immortality of the Soul and a future State as *Principles of natural Religion.* His Grace well knew that the Immortality of the Soul, as it is collected from the Light of Nature, stands upon a Foundation totally different from that of a Resurrection of the Dead. He therefore recollects himself and goes on thus :

“ Yet I do not find but that *these* also are rather supposed than expressly revealed in the Bible.”

Here again, if you take the Word THESE to refer to Immortality and a future State *assured*

to Mankind by the Resurrection of Christ, as the Connexion of the Discourse plainly requires, you make the Preacher not only inconsistent with himself, but guilty of a palpable Untruth. Nothing can be more inconsistent than to say that the *same Thing* is rather *supposed* than *expressly revealed* in a Book which records a Fact that gives us the *highest* and *firmest Assurance* of that Thing. Nothing more false than to say that the Life and Immortality brought to Light by the Gospel, and assured to us by the Resurrection of Christ, are *not* expressly revealed in the Bible; taking that Word (as the Archbishop must have done, unless you will fix upon him a contemptible Quibble) for the whole of divine Revelation.

Thus hath his Grace *twice* put the Change upon us (and without doubt upon himself) in the Compass of a very few Lines, by leading us to take THEM in the first of these Periods, and THESE in the latter for Relatives to the same Antecedent, when indeed they refer to two very different Subjects. But let us hear him out.

“ Indeed the Immortality of the Soul [as a
 “ Principle of natural Religion] may be infered
 “ from several Places of Scripture, and the Tenor of the whole Bible.”

Very possible. And what may *not* be infered from the Bible by those who, as Bishop Burnet says, *will go and form Systems out of some general Hints?*

“ And so a future State [may be infer’d] which,
 “ as for the Thing itself, seems to be supposed
 “ [in the Bible] as a Thing acknowledged by
 “ natural Light.”

Now the Tenor of the *whole* Bible with respect to a future State, is plainly this. In the Scriptures of the Old Testament (if you except those Prophecies

Prophecies and Types which signified and prefigured the Redemption of Man by Jesus Christ ; a Point confessedly out of the Reach of natural Light, and far enough from being understood by the ancient Jews) a future State is no where *supposed* at all. And the Sanctions of the Law of *Moses*, being the Rewards and Punishments of the present Life *only*, would naturally lead to the contrary Supposition, namely, that there would be *no* future State.

On the other hand, in the New Testament a future State is not barely *supposed*, but *revealed* and *declared* with the utmost Precision ; and both the *Knowledge* and the *Accomplishment* of the Thing itself made to depend upon a particular Matter of Fact, the Resurrection of *Jesus Christ* ; which I suppose Dr. *Tillotson* himself never imagined to be a Dictate of natural Religion.

Mark now how the Archbishop represents this Testimony of the Gospel. He tells us, "The Scripture hath ONLY revealed the Circumstances of " it [a future State] more particularly, and given " us higher Assurances of the Thing."

More particularly than what? Why more particularly than the Light of Nature.—Now the Light of Nature puts the future Existence of the human Soul upon its being a Principle distinct from, and, in its own Nature, independent of perishable Matter ; and ascribes its Immortality to a Capacity of living in a State of *Disunion* from the Body. According to natural Light, if the Soul had *not* this Capacity, it would *not* be immortal. Whereas the Scripture puts the Immortality of the Soul (if we must use that loose Term) upon the Capacity it is in of being *reunited* to the Body after Death ; and not only *supposes* but positively *asserts*, that without such
Reunion

Reunion the whole compound Man will absolutely perish. 1 Cor. xv. 18.

With what Propriety then, or with what Truth could the Archbishop say, that the Scripture *only* reveals the *Circumstances* of a future State *more particularly* than the Light of Nature does, when the Circumstances of a future State taught by the Light of Nature, are declared by the Scripture to be absolutely fictitious and imaginary?

“ But, it seems, if there were no Revelation
 “ Men might be persuaded of these, [the Immor-
 “ tality of the Soul, and a future State] and so
 “ the Heathens were by Arguments drawn partly
 “ from the Operations of the Soul, which *would*
 “ *almost persuade any Man* that the Soul is immor-
 “ tal; it being altogether unimaginable how a
 “ Principle that is nothing else but Matter, can
 “ either understand or determine itself by its own
 “ Will; all the Motions of Matter that we
 “ know of, or can imagine being necessary?”

What Men *might be persuaded of*, is one Thing; whether their Persuasions were well grounded is quite another. If we believe Revelation, these Heathens were mistaken. And there were other Heathens, of no less Penetration, who neither drew these Conclusions nor admitted these Premises.

As to the Argument itself, some Philosophers have said, that from the Operations of the Soul by the Mediation of bodily Organs, you can determine nothing concerning the Operations of the Soul when divested of those Organs.

Others have said, that granting the Immateriality of the Soul, you never can prove its Immortality by that Medium; since the Motions of a *created* Spirit may be as necessary as the Motions of Matter; and that whatever Arguments
 you

you use to prove that those Motions are *not* necessary, will equally prove the Spirit to be immortal *a parte ante*; or, in other Words, *uncreated* or *sempiternal*; which is more, we presume, than a *Christian* Philosopher wuld desire to prove concerning the *human* Soul.

His Grace goes on to some other natural Principles by which Men might be persuaded of the Immortality of the Soul and a future State, without the Aid of Revelation, namely, the *Goodness* and *Justice* of God.

“ The Consideration of God’s Goodness, says he, would persuade a Man, that as he made all Things very good, so he made them of the longest Duration they were capable of.”

But if you will needs furnish *Nature* with Lights from *Revelation*, be so fair as to lay the whole State of the Case before her. If these Heathens had learn’d so much from *Moses* as to know that God *at the Beginning* made all Things *very good*, it is great Odds but they would learn so much more from him as to know, that MAN, the *living Soul*, who came *upright* out of the Hands of the Creator, continued no long Time to be *very good*, and that, on this very Account, his Duration was abridged. Without the Help of *Moses* these Heathens would see human Nature in no better Condition than *Moses* represents it to be *after* the Fall: and from that View of Man, we may well apprehend they would not be very likely to argue in Favour of his Duration, upon the Supposition of his extraordinary Goodness.

Nor is the Argument for a future State, drawn from the *Justice* of God, upon a better Foundation at all. “ The Justice of God, according to his Grace, would easily induce a Man to believe, seeing the Providence of God doth
“ generally

“ generally in this Life deal promiscuously with
 “ good and bad Men, that there shall be a Day
 “ which will make a Difference, and every Man
 “ shall receive according to his Works.”

That the Face of the World hath indeed in *general* always exhibited these Appearances of unequal Distribution, is very true. But no Body knew better than his Grace, that the Heathens were far from being uniform in drawing Consequences from them in Favour of a future State. Some of them concluded from these Appearances that there were no Gods. Others, that there was no Providence, or that the Gods did not at all concern themselves about human Affairs. And some insisted that, notwithstanding these Appearances, Justice was done to every one sooner or later in this World.

With respect to the Merit of the Argument, Men must first be in Possession of the Matter of Fact before they can pretend to draw any certain Conclusions from it ; and what Rule had the Heathens by which to judge who were good, and who were bad, but mere *Appearances*?

A certain learned Writer hath observed that,
 “ there would oftentimes be the Appearance of
 “ Inequality, even when and where an equal
 “ Providence was actually administred.” I would desire to know how we shall determine, *in any given Case*, that this Inequality is *more* than Appearance, now that we certainly know an equal Providence is *not* administred? If you should take upon you to judge by such Evidence as you may have from Men’s outward Actions, professed Opinions, or visible Circumstances in Life, who is under the Displeasure of God, who *is* punished in this World, or who *will be* punished in the next, Archbishop Tillot-

son himself will tell you, that “all such Judgments are rash and uncharitable, the Effect of an odious Temper, and no other than a fond Persuasion that God is like your self, that he cannot but hate those whom you hate, and punish those whom you will punish.”

This is likewise the Language of Revelation, which turns this Argument of natural Religion upside down, and shews that we should never be able to know that Good and Evil are unequally distributed in *this* Life, if it were not revealed that there will be a future State of Rewards and Punishments in *another*. Take away the Light of Revelation, and God may, for ought you know, or possibly can know, administer strict Justice in this World. Even Revelation itself does not qualify us to judge what particular Persons are for the present in a better or worse Situation than they deserve; there being numberless Circumstances relating to the secret Motives and Intention of every Man's Actions; his Way of estimating the Good and Evil of human Life; the Rise and Progress of his Associations and Prejudices; the Strength or Weakness of his Intellects; the Nature of his worldly Connexions; his Constitution and bodily Habit, &c. which may be of great Weight in the Sight of God, but can never come into any Account that Men are able to take either of his real Desert and Demerit, or of the Measure of his Happiness or Misery on Earth.

Thus we see this great Master of Reasoning perplexing himself and his Readers by confounding two Things as distinct and as opposite as Day and Night; namely, Immortality and a future State by the Means of a Resurrection, and Immortality and a future State without a Resurrection; and thereby

thereby reducing himself to the Necessity of making the very same Thing proveable and not proveable, most expressly and assuredly revealed in the Scriptures, and yet rather supposed and taken for granted in the same Scriptures than expressly revealed. With what Penetration of Judgment and Perspicuity of Language would this great Man have exposed the Fallacy that runs through this Paragraph on any other Subject in which his own Prejudices were less interested?

It has ever been Matter of some Surprize to me that Christian Divines should lay so much Stress, as some of them have done, upon these supposed-Lights of natural Religion. When *Tillotson* says, that the Arguments of certain heathen Philosophers in Proof of the Immortality of the Soul, *would almost persuade any Man, &c.* he is modest in Comparison of others who will have them to come nothing short of Demonstration. And yet nothing so plain as that this Sort of Demonstration cannot possibly consist with evangelical Demonstration. Of this, I suppose some of our Divines may heretofore have been conscious, and yet, apprehending some very strange and frightful Consequences if these precious Discoveries of natural Light were to be given up, they were resolved to verify and realize them by some Means or other. What was to be done? *Life and Immortality as brought to Light by the Gospel*, left not the least Room for them in that Department. Nothing remained but an *intermediate State*. There they might thrive and subsist long enough at least for the Credit and Purposes of their Patrons. And this, I am apt to believe, is the very Consideration which has kept this unaccountable Hypothesis so long on foot

among Protestants, and tempted them to look for some Foundation for it in the Scriptures, though ever so obscure and precarious.

But soft and fair. Let us consider in good Time what we are doing, and what may be the Consequences of our Temerity.

“ Amongst many Things, says a leading Genius
 “ of the present Age, which may be mentioned
 “ in Favour of *Tillotson*, this should not be
 “ forgotten, that of those who have passed their
 “ Judgments upon him, there never was a *Son*
 “ of *Absurdity* who did not *dislike*, or a *sensible*
 “ *Reader* who did not approve his Writings.”

Who knows but the foregoing Remarks may bring us within the Verge of this mortifying Sentence? Which, however it escaped him, is not of a Piece with the usual Temper and Candour of this learned, elegant, and amiable Writer.

But be it so. What Remedy? The Memory of *Tillotson* we revere as of one who in his Day was in the foremost Rank of good Writers, and, what is better, of good Men. But having done him this Justice, we have a Privilege of our own to plead which must not be given up upon the Peril of an hard Name ;—the Privilege of appealing from *Tillotson* and his whole Body of Admirers to the *venerable Christianity of the New Testament*, which we presume to think worthy of an higher Office than that of holding the Candle to the Figments of Philosophy.

POSTSCRIPT.

JUST as the foregoing Papers were finished for the Press a small Pamphlet was put into my Hands, intituled *Remarks upon a late Treatise relating to an intermediate State, &c.* meaning Dr. Law's Appendix. As the Merits of this Writer's Scheme lie within a very little Compass, it has been thought good to give it a transient Review, without entering into any Particulars which have fallen under our Consideration already; referring such Readers as desire to have full Satisfaction concerning the Points upon which this whole Controversy turns, to an excellent Tract lately published by the learned and judicious Mr. Peckard.

This *Remarker's* Hypothesis then, so far as I comprehend it, stands thus:

“ Man is a Compound of *Brute* and *Angel*.
 “ The *brutal* or sensual and corporeal Part of
 “ of him is, by Death, separated from the *an-*
 “ *gelic* or the rational and moral Part; which,
 “ consisting of pure Mind or Spirit, lives, per-
 “ ceives, and acts in the same State and Manner
 “ that *Angels* do. If this Mind or Spirit, after
 “ its Separation from the Body, remains tinc-
 “ tured and polluted with that Sensuality de-
 “ rived from the *Brute*, it becomes diabolical,
 “ and lives in Misery, as wicked Angels or De-
 “ vils do, and is of the same Nature with them.
 “ If it is cleansed and purified, during its Union
 “ with the Body, by the Discipline of holy Ha-
 “ bits, and the Grace of the Gospel, it lives in
 “ Hap-

“ Happiness as the holy Angels do, being likewise, after the Death of the Body, of the same Nature with them.”——“ And therefore, says this Writer, where any Man does in Reality (and not in Pretence only) believe that the intellectual and moral Spirits of the holy Angels *can* enjoy God without Bodies, they [he] ought to allow that the intellectual and moral Spirits of good Men *may* do the same; or at least shew us (if they [he] can) how the former are able to do it, and not the latter; but that is impossible.” *Remarks*, p. 7—12.

Instead of undertaking the Proof of *Impossibles*, we will *shew* him, what will answer the End just as well, that his whole Hypothesis is a mere Fiction, and plainly repugnant to the Christian Scriptures.

Our blessed Saviour tells us, that IN THE RESURRECTION *the Children of God, or good Men, are AS OR EQUAL UNTO the Angels of God in Heaven.* Matth. xxii. 30. Luke xx. 36.

Whence it follows, either that there is *no Difference* between the *intermediate* State of good Men, and the State in which the same good Men will be *after* the Resurrection; or that good Men will not be AS OR EQUAL UNTO the *holy Angels* in *any* State *before* the Resurrection.

But this is not all; for it follows likewise, either that the holy Angels *do not* enjoy God *without* Bodies, or that good Men will not be AS the *Angels of God* in the Resurrection.

And here ends our Debate with this extraordinary Remarker; for all the Use he makes of the few Scripture-proofs to which he has appealed, is to twist and squeeze them into a Coincidence with these *Imaginations* concerning the *angelic* Nature of the separate Soul: Which being utterly

ly

ly groundless, and contrary to our Saviour's Doctrine, he must of course have given a mistaken Sense to them all; as might easily be shewn (if it had not been done before) by descending to Particulars.

What seems to have misled this Author into all his Mis-apprehension on this Subject (which in some Instances is truly pitiable) is the extraordinary Stress he lays on a loose Expression in our Burial-Office, importing that *the Souls of the Faithful, after they are delivered from the Burden of the Flesh, are with God, in Joy and Felicity*. Upon this Circumstance He builds his state of *separate Existence*, supposing, as it should seem, that they who rise again *with their Bodies*, will be once more incumbered with this *Burden of the Flesh*. Unmindful herein of *Paul's* Doctrine, that *Flesh and Blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God*: Which is however the more excuseable, as he has likewise overlooked the Consequences of once more *re-uniting* the *Brute* and the *Angel*, upon his own Hypothesis.

Whereas had he considered, that the whole Man will be *raised incorruptible*, and become wholly *spiritualized* at the general Resurrection, he might have perceived that all his Arguments for a *separate* or an *intermediate* State, whether taken from the spiritual Nature of the Soul, *i. e.* of a Soul delivered from the Burden of the Flesh, or from the special Effects and Operations of the Holy Ghost upon such a Soul, are manifestly superseded by this Doctrine of the Apostle *Paul*, which indeed leaves not only no Necessity, but even not so much as any imaginable Use for an *intermediate* State.

But these are Considerations of little Weight with *Liturgic* Saints. Their principal Aim is,

as

as Mr. G. has it, *to establish the Doctrine of Our Church*, at all Events. In the Prosecution of which pious Design, instead of accommodating the inaccurate Language of our public Forms to the true meaning of Scripture (as common Sense, and common Honesty direct in our present unreformed Circumstances) they are for ever wresting the Scripture to a *Conformity* with a Service composed at a Time when our well-meaning Forefathers had but few of the Lights and Advantages, with respect to Theological Studies, which we now enjoy : Not to mention the Necessity they were under to let many things pass, in mere compliance with popular Prejudices, and views of Policy, which they could not over-rule.

If these Orthodox Gentlemen would be content to keep their Interpretations to themselves, and for their own peculiar Use, we might bear with them. We only desire to enjoy our own Liberty, and should never attempt to deprive them of theirs. But when they are for cramming their Notions down our Throats, on the pain of being treated as Revolters from our unfeigned *Assent* and *Consent*, &c. they must not be surpris'd if we make a little Resistance.

The Fruits of *this* Spirit, indeed, have not always been what our zealous Brethren probably expected. The Engine designed to play this *Assent* and *Consent* upon the Heterodox only, has oftentimes recoiled upon the Operator himself with double Force. A misfortune to which our orthodox Remarker hath unhappily exposed himself on the present Occasion.

Thus if, as the Remarker objects, Dr. Law in repeating the *Te deum* declares, contrary to what he believes, that *the glorious Company of the Apostles are now praising God*; the Remarker himself

himself shews him the way, when, a Versicle or two before, *He* declares that, *all the Earth doth worship God the Father Everlasting*. Is this true? or does the Remarker believe it to be true in the strict literal Sense of the Words? The Remarker speaks in this Pamphlet of *Infidels* and *Atheists*; and others tell us of gross *Idolaters* in different parts of the Earth; are these to be ranked with the *Worshippers of God the Father everlasting*? or are we to conclude that the Remarker is *Self-condemned as often as he repeats this Sentence to God himself, and in his own House*? And be it farther observed, that we fix this Inconsistency upon him, without departing from the Words of the Hymn, whereas he is obliged to falsify the Text, both of the *Te Deum* and the *Burial Office*, before he can come at the Doctor. For whatever he may think, there is a considerable Difference between, the glorious Company, *&c. praise thee*, and, the glorious Company, *&c. are now praising thee*. So likewise the Office at Burial, does not say, as he cites it, *So soon as they are delivered, &c.* but, *after they are delivered, &c.* A Proposition, which Dr. Law may either subscribe or repeat with as much Sincerity as the Remarker himself, for any thing that appears in the *Appendix*.

And yet this is the pure spiritual Saint who has said nothing out of an *uncharitable Spirit* or *Ill-will* to any Man living! This Man who loads Dr. Law with the Guilt of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, for deviating, as he thinks, from his unfeigned *Assent* and *Consent* to certain Expressions, which he himself must believe to be precarious and equivocal, by his altering the *form* of them before he could fix his Accusation!

L

This

This Man, in fine, who hath expunged from his List of *true Christians*, every one that does not believe a Doctrine, which, if it was ever so true in it's self, he has taken pains to render utterly incredible to those Christians who are inclined to pay more regard to the Words of *Jesus Christ* himself than to the Systematical Dreams of a Superstitious Churchman.

THE END

from
doc-
ver so
ut-
e in-
Jesus
ms of